A critical study of
THE PRATĀPARUDRĪYA

Dr. Rāmavarapu Śarat Bābu
M.A. (Skt), M.A. (Tel), M.A. (Phil), Ph.D., Diploma in Theatre Arts

SONTY PUBLICATIONS
KNOWLEDGE IS TRUTH OF LIFE

A Publication

of

SONTY RENAISSANCE INTERNATIONAL (SRI) FOUNDATION

3042 CARMEL DRIVE

FLOSS MOOR IL.60422, U.S.A

&

SUSARLA INTERNATIONAL TRUST ACADEMY (SITA)

48-9-16, DWARAKANAGAR

VISAKHAPATNAM - 530 016, A.P. INDIA

Printed at :
SPAA OFFSET COLOUR PRINTS
Visakhapatnam - 530 016, A.P., INDIA
✆ : 91 - 0891 - 547600,
Fax : 91 - 0891 - 547190
Telex : 0495 - 504 SPAA IN (Press)

Dedicated to the wonderful couple

Dr. Sriram Sonti & Mrs. Sarada Purna

With best of regards and friendly thoughts

CONTENTS

		Page No
Prefatory Note		
Acknowledgements		
Abbreviations		
Introductory		1
Chapter I		
	Nāyaka Prakaraṇa	7
Chapter II		
	Kāvya Prakaraṇa	15
Chapter III		
	Nāṭaka Prakaraṇa	37
Chapter IV		
	Rasa Prkaraṇa	68
Chapter V		
	Doṣa Prakaraṇa	112
Chapter VI		
	Guṇa Prakaraṇa	135
Chapter VII		
	Śabdālaṅkāra Prakaraṇa	141
Chapter VIII		
	Arthālaṅkāra Prakaraṇa	148
Chapter IX		
	Miśrālaṅkāra Prakaraṇa	195
Vidyānātha as a Poet		197
Conclusion		205
Footnotes		206
Bibliography		237

ABBREVIATIONS

Ac.SS	:	SAHITYASARA of Achutaraya
A.K.	:	AMARAKOSA of Amarasimha
Al.San.	:	ALANKARASANGRAHA of Amrtanandayogin
Al.Sar	:	ALANKARASARVASVA of Ruyyaka
A.P.	:	AGNIPURANA of Vedavyasa
A.P.Y	:	ANDHRA PRATAPARUDRYA YASOBHUSANAMU of Rangacharya, C
A.S.	:	ALANKARASEKHARA of Kesavamisra
Asta	:	ASTADHYAYI of Panini
B.P.	:	BHAVAPRAKASA of Saradatanaya
Bh.Kav.	:	KAVYALANKARA of Bhamaha
C.C.	:	CAMATKARACHANDRIKA of Viśvesvara
C.L.	:	CHANDRALOKA of Jayadeva
D.R.	:	DASARUPAKA of Dhananjaya
Dhva	:	DHVANYALOKA of Anandavardhana
Eka.	:	EKAVALI of Vidhayadara
Hem. Kav.	:	KAVYANUSASANA of Hemachandra
Kad	:	KADAMBARI of Bana
K.D	:	KAVYADARSA of Dandin
K.M.	:	KAVYAMIMAMSA of Rajasekhara
Ka.P.	:	KAVYENDUPRAKASA of Kamaraja Diksita
K.P.	:	KAVYAPRAKASA of Mammata
Ka. Su.	:	KAVYALANKARASUTRAVRTTI of Vamana
Kira.	:	KIRATARJUNIYA of Bharavi
L.S.D.	:	LAWS & PRACTICE OF SANSKRIT DRAMA of Surendranath Sastri

N.D.	:	NATYADARPANA of Ramacandra & Gunacandra
N.L.R.	:	NATAKALAKSANARATNAKOSA of Sagaranandin
N.S.	:	NATYASASTRA of Bharata
N.Y.	:	NANJARAJAYASOBHUSANA of Abhinava Kalidasa
P.R.	:	PRATAPARUDRIYA of Vidyanatha
Raghu.	:	RAGHUVAMSA of Kalidasa
R.A.	:	RASARNAVALANKARA of Prakasavarsa
R.G.	:	RASAGANGADHARA of Jagannatha
R.M.	:	RASAMANJARI of Bhanudatta
R.S.	:	RASARNAVASUDHAKARA of Singabhupala
Rud. Kav.	:	KAVYALANKARA of Rudrata
S.D.	:	SAHITYADARPANA of Visvanatha
SKA.	:	SARASVATIKANTHABHARANA of Bhoja
Srng.	:	SATAKATRAYADI SUBHASITA SANGRAHA of Bhartrhari
S.S.	:	SAHITYASARA of Sarvesvara
S.T.	:	SRNGARATILAKA of Rudrata
T.S.	:	TARKASANGRAHA of Annambhatta
Ud. Kav.	:	KAVYALANKARASANGRAHA of Udbhata
Vag. Al.	:	VAGBHATALANKARA of Vagbhata
Vag. Kav.	:	KAVYANUSASANA of Vagbhata
Vikra.	:	VIKRAMORVASIYA of Kalidasa
V.V.	:	VRTTIVARTIKA of Appayadiksita
Vs.	:	VENISAMHARA of Bhattanarayana
Vy.V.	:	VYAKTIVIVEKA of Mahimabhatta

PREFATORY NOTE

The theories relating to the literary criticism are more or less well established by the time of Vidyanatha. Though various theroies on Poetics are well discussed by diffierent authors, they are not brought out in a single compendium before Vidyanatha. Though Mammata's Kavyaprakasa has gone a long way in that direction, it does not speak anything of Drsyakavya, the most powerful and attractive type of Poetry. In this context, it is Vidyanatha who realised the need of bringing all the elements of Kavya in a single compendium with all the appropriate and attractive illustrations to cater to the demands of a lay student of literary criticism. It is to be noted that Vidyanatha is very much aware of his own limitations in the preparation of such a text. That is why he categorically mentions the reason, at the very outset, for taking up such a task.

As late Dr. V. Raghavan rightly observes, the Prataparudriya can be considered as a work of derivative nature and it is evidednt that Vidyanatha belongs to the Rasadhvani school of thought. He has studied all the works of his predecessors and defined various concepts of Alankarasastra with his own illustrative poems eulogising his patron, king Prataparudra. The idea of giving one's own illustrations is a novel one, and as such, the Prataparudriya may be considered as pioneer work. It may be said in this connection that this type of writing has its beginning in Vidyanatha and got its perfection at the hands of Jagannatha, who almost gave decisive conclusions to different concepts in Alankarasastra. The idea of writing such a work can be traced to the Ravanavadha of Bhatti. Though there is immense influence of works like the Kavyaprakasa, Dasarupaka, Rasakalika, Sarasvatikanthabharana and Alankarasarvasva on the Prataparudriya in its theory part, Vidyanatha in his turn inspired his successors to a great extent. The Camatakaracandrika of Visvesvara, the Sahityaratnakara of Dharmasurin, the Alankarasudhanidhi of Sayanacarya, the Alankaramanjusa of Devasankarapurohita, the Nanjarajayasobhusana of Narasimha (Abhinavakalidasa), the

Raghunathabhupaliya of Krshnayajvan, the Godavarmayasobhusana of Arunagiri, the Alankaracintamani of Ajitasena and the Ekavali of Vidyadhara stand as monumental testimonies to this fact.

The Prataparudriya is evidently a Prakaranagrantha for Alankarasastra which is being studied almost from the time of its composition. Though the original contribution of Vidyanatha is not much, the popularity of the Prataparudriya can not be under estimated as it served to be one of the conspectus of text books under reference.

In this context it is worthwhile to mention the introductory remarks of Mr. Filliozat in his French translation of the Prataparudriya.

> "Son ouvrage comporte bien peu des speculations
> esthetiques qui avaient anime autrefois le Sastra.
> Ainsi se presente-t-il comme une sorte de lexique
> des termes techniques de poetique et de dramaturgie"

- LE PRATAPARUDRIYA" by Pierre Sylvain FILLIOZAT p.v.

Which says that the work (The Prataparudriya) contains very few of the aesthetic speculations which generally occupy such an important part in the Sastras and what it presents is more of lexicon of the technical terms of Poetry and dramaturgy.

The Prataparudriya is also quoted by no less than the prince of commentators, Mallinatha, though not by name. Apart from Mallinatha it is said that Ramacandrabudhendra cites this text again and again in the Tikas on Campuramayana and the three Satakas of Bhartrhari. Again to quote Filliozat -

> "Il fut particulierement connue de Mallinatha,
> constamment cite par un autre commentateur dorigine
> telugu, Ramacandrabudhendra, autour de tika sur le
> Campuramayana les trois centuries de Bhartrhari ....."

- LE PRATAPARUDRIYA" by Pierre Sylvain FILLIOZAT p.v.

The Prataparudriya is also quoted in the Alankarakaustubha of Visvesvarapandita who defends the stand of Vidyanatha against the criticism of Appayyadiksita.

The Prataparudriya has nine chapters. It consists of Karikas, Vrtti and Udaharana slokas. The total Karikas in the text are three hundred and thirty and the illustrative verses are five hundred, out of which some twenty five verses are repeated once and occasionally twice. The fact that there are sixty two Prakrt verses testifies to the scholarship of Vidyanatha and his ease at composing the verses even in Prakrt.

Though Vidyanatha is at his best in composing the verses with a high imagery note it is a matter of regret that this point of perfection which he has kept in other chapters has not been touched in the Drama part written to illustrate the former theory part. Viewed either from the aesthetic aspect of Indian school or from the stand of action, conflict and suspense of Western school, the drama composed by Vidyanatha falls short of the expected standards. His drama entitled "Prataparudra Rajyabhiseka" though consists of five acts the scope of action, suspense and conflict are totally absent in it. It runs more or less in a reported way of incidents by the supporting characters. For instance, there is neither the characters of Nayika or Pratinayaka in the drama. The greatness of Prataparudra is rather narrated by others. Viewed from the canons of drama, this is a serious draw back of the play, for, the spectator is at a loss to witness the greatness of the hero of the drama directly. This is the reason for its unpopularity as a separate drama though the verses given for illustration are otherwise poetically perfect. No doubt they appeal the reader in their theoretical aspect but from the theatrical point of view, they fail to get the admiration of spectators.

Thus the work of Vidyanatha though certain aberrations are present here and there, on the whole makes a very good treatise for the beginners in view of its perspecuity and brevity of the contents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have helped me either directly or indirectly in producing this thesis.

I am extremely grateful to late Kalaprapurna Dr. Viswanatha Satyanarayana, M.A., D.Litt., recipient of prestigeous Jnanapith Award, at whose feet I first studied the text. He was responsible to inculcate literary taste in me even at my teen age.

I can hardly pay back my debt of gratitude to Mrs. Saradapurna Sonti, a former student of mine, a constant flow of inspiration in completing my thesis. Again it is she who evinced a keen interest in publishing this work. Her *'nirvyaja sraddha'* and *'Manasvita'* has enabled the work to see the light of the day so soon.

I am indebted to late Professor V. Raghavan who has encouraged me to work on this topic and gave me his valuable suggestions to frame the format of this thesis.

I am greatly indebted to Professor P. Sriramamurti under whose able guidance and supervision I was able to complete this thesis. He is the person who has initiated this topic. But for his constant inspiration the present work would have not been completed in this satisfactory manner. Similarly, I am very thankful to late Dr. V. Subba Rao, former Emeritus Professor of Sanskrit, who has kindly accepted to be my Joint Director and encouraged me in many ways inquiring often about the progress in my work.

I express my profound gratitude to Dr. G. Parthasaradhy Rao, Reader and former Head of Sanskrit Department of this University for his incessant inspiration and kind help extended to me right from the beginning to the finishing stages of this work. As he taught me this text at the post-graduate level, I always depended on him for every clarification in my study. Words fail to adequately thank him.

It is my pleasant duty to express my thankfulness to Professor J. Prabhakara Sastry and Sri A. Someswara Sarma, Retired Reader, Department of Sanskrit who have helped me in many a way by their elderly advice and their most valuable clarifications on some of the crucial points on the text. My elderly and learned friend Sri K.A Krishnamacharyulu, former Reader, Department of Sanskrit deserves my heart felt thanks for his generous gesture in lending me his paper-manuscript of 'Ratnasana' commentary on 'The Prataparudriya'.

I am extremely grateful to Professor K. Kunjunni Raja, Director, Adayar Library and Research Institute, for focusing my attention to some of the important points of the study from time to time.

I will be failing in my duty if I do not thank the Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan for their generous scholarship in the beginning of my Research.

My sincere thanks are due to Mr. Phillips. B. Wagoner, fulbright scholar, Wisconsin University, U.S.A. who was studying some Sanskrit and Telugu texts with me, for his kind explanation of the French translation of the Prataparudriya by Pierre - Sylvain FILLOZAT.

My wife Mrs. Vijayalakshmi has always tried to keep me away from the exacting cares of the house hold inspite of her busy schedule of conducting the Music Classes. My daughter Mrs. Madhuri Devi, a Veena artiste and my son Mr. Ravindra Tejasvi, a post graduate student of Sanskrit and a Mridangam artiste, have always looked after my personal comforts. To all the three members of my home I certainly owe my supreme gratification.

Dr. RAMAVARAPU SARAT BABU

VISAKHAPATNAM
17th August, 1994.

INTRODUCTORY

In the history of literary criticism in Sanskrit, Ānandavardhana marks an epoch by enunciating the Dhvani theory. He tried also to accommodate the earlier views on Poetry and to give them a place in criticism in the light of his theory. Among his followers, Abhinavagupta and Mammaṭa are the two great authors who defended his position and established the Dhvani theory meeting all its adversaries. While Abhinavagupta accomplished it by writing commentaries on the Nāṭyaśāstra and the Dhvanyāloka, the two great classics of Rasa and Dhvani theories respectively, Mammata wrote an independent treatise on poetics presenting a comprehensive theory of literary criticism mainly based on the views of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta. Thus, the Kāvyaprakāśa occupies a unique place in Sanskrit criticism. All other works that followed the Kāvyaprakasa bear a clear imprint thereof now and then displaying originality at places.

Vidyānatha's patron was king Prataparudra who ruled the Kākatīya kingdom during the period 1290-1326 A.D. His capital was Warangal which is about 50 Kilometers from Hyderabad, the present capital of Andhra Pradesh. There are no counter arguments for the above date though different historians assign the date with a variation of few years to the above. Vidyānātha was supposed to be the court poet of Pratāparudra. There is absolutely no other work in his name, yet some traditional scholars opine that Vidyānātha is no other person than Agastyapaṇḍita, the author of Nalakirtikaumudi, Kṛṣṇacarita and Bālabhārata. They observe that Vidyanatha might have been the designation he held. But scholars like Dr. A.K. Warder and T. Venkatacarya did not favour this supposition.

A critical study of the text also affirms the above date. In the Prologue of the text, Vidyanatha quotes a number of authors. Ruyyaka was the latest author quoted by Vidyānātha who can be placed during 1135-1145 A.D. So one can deduce that he is later than 1145 A.D.

It is very evident that the famous commentator Mallinātha uses many a passage from Pratāparudrīya though he did not acknowledge him by name. Mallinātha may safely be placed during 1422-1466 A.D. With this much of internal evidence and relying upon the reports of the research carried out so far pertaining to the date of Pratāparudra, one need not have any hesitation to say that Vidyānātha flourished some time between 1275 and 1325 A.D.

There are two commentaries available on the text - one is Ratnāpaṇa of Kumarāsvamisomapithin and the other being Ratnaśāṇa written by Chilakamarri Tirumalacarya. The latter is not yet published completely, though we find the commentary on the first two chapters in K.P. Trivedi's edition of Pratāparudrīya. Kumarāsvamin was the son of Mallināthasūri who is regarded as the prince of the commentators and who flourished in the times of Prauḍhadevarāya II, of Vijayanagar during 1419-46 A.D. So one can safely assign the 15th Century to Kumārasvāmin. It is evident that Tirumalacarya is posterior to Kumarasvamin from his own writings. Tirumalācārya paid high tributes to the masterly commentary of Kumaraṣvamin and said that his commentary is mainly meant for the beginners [1]. Tirumalācārya belongs to the 18th Century.

Among the followers of Mammata, Vidyānātha and Vidyadhāra stand apart in that they have started a new type of Alaṅkāra treatises called popularly the Yaśobhūṣana type. It may be said that Vidyānāthā's Pratāparudriyā has come to enjoy greater popularity, especially in the South. Vidyānātha has modelled his work after the Kāvyaprakāśa. But he followed a novel way of providing suitable illustrations to his theoretical concepts. He composed verses and even a small drama himself afresh by way of illustration. He defended his method in the following way : Vidyanatha considered an Alaṅkāra treatise as a separate and independent Prabandha which requires as a unity of its own even in the subject matter of the illustrations furnished therein. Hence he talks of the Nayaka to be chosen in all the illustrations

uniterally, the entire body of illustrations forming a single Kavya as it were. He claims that such an attempt was not made earlier :

> *'Punyaslokasya caritamudaharanamarhati I*
> *na kascit tadrsah purvaiah prabandhabharanikrtah II'* [2]

He compares it also to the Rāmayāna and the Mahabharata where great epic heroes like Rāma are described. Incidentally he is paying his tributes to his patron Prātaparudra whom he considers as an ideal ruler and a great man. He says that a treatise on poetics has come to serve its full purpose, now in that it has been able to project the glory of Prātaparudra an ideal king who is made the main subject matter of his illustrations :

> *'Cirena caritārtho 'bhūt kāvyālankārasangrahah I*
> *Pratāparudradevasya kīrtiryena prakāśyate II* [3]

He says further that the description of such a hero brings name and fame to the writer and his work as well.

Vidyānātha holds that the main purpose of Poetry is to teach the Purusarthas - the four ends of life namely Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Moksa. It is to be accomplished through the description of an ideal man. Kumarasvamin observes that infact the concepts of Rasa etc., acquire a new polish when they are described in respect of an ideal hero. Such gems of concepts polished with the touch stone of the choice of the hero are given in the Pratāparudrīya.

Vidyānātha emphasises the importance of the choice of a proper hero for imparting the right instruction through peotry. He refers to the prohibitive sentence - *'Kāvyālāpamśca varjayet'*. He considers that the sentence refers to such poem which do not have an ideal hero for its suject matter and thus fail to impart proper instruction. He goes to the extent of saying that the Śāstra literature too gains its popularity as it establishes the existence of Isvara, as the supreme hero enacting the universal drama of creation.

'Tatha vaisesikadeh isvarapratisthapakataya jagatpujyata'

The Mahābhāratā also becomes an extraordinary epic since it describes the great deeds of the personalities like Srikrsna. It is said that the Upanisads indeed excel all other literature because they speak of and establish the existence of the Almighty God. Even the Purvamīmāmśāsastra which speaks of Dharma becomes praise-worthy as Dharma forms the main characteristic feature of an ideal man.

He then furnishes a good number of Slokas from various authors in support of his position. Except in the case of Dandin all the rest of the quotations are not to be traced in their works. This may be due to the fact that the versions of the texts consulted by Vidyanatha in this connection are different from those that have come down to us.

In course of his discussion he gives a three fold division of literature - Prabhusammita, Mitrasammita and Kantasammita. The purpose of all the literature is the same, viz., teaching the four ends of life. They should help the reader in choosing the right and avoiding the wrong. The Vedic literature accomplishes this task through its injunctions found in the Brāhmanas. They are like the rules of law made by the king. Hence such a literature is called Prabhusammita. The Purānas narrating stories of past kings teach us like friends through the examples of their lives. Hence they are called Mitrasammitas. But the Kavya literature scores over them in its appeal. It makes one realise his duties telling him suggestively and pleasingly as a beloved wife advises her consort. Hence it is called Kantasammita. He gives a good stanza eulogising such poetic literature :

'Yadvedat prabhusammitadadhigatam sabdapradhanacchiram
Yaccharthaprvanāt puranavacanādistam suhrtsammitāt
Kantasammitayā yaya sarasātamapādya kavyasriya
Kartāvye kutuki budho viracitastasyai sprham kurmahe' [5]

Concluding the discussion he quotes from the Kavyaprākasa

where pleasure and instruction are equally emphasised as the purpose of Poetry[6]. In this connection other incidental benefits accruing to both the poet and the reader are also mentioned.

Kumārasvāmin discusses the issue of the purpose of Poetry. He purports to say that the purpose of poetry is manifold. Pleasure too is derived both by the poet and the reader. He remarks that at the time of deriving pleasure from one's own work the poet acts as a Sahṛdaya

'Nirvṛttikāle kavirapi sahṛdaya eva' [7].

The teaching of the four ends of life is also accomplished side by side. But the principal purpose that is served by Poetry is transcendental aesthetic pleasure in itself. This is indeed the secret of Poetic appeal. Otherwise Poetry cannot be said to be pleasing as the beloved (Kantasammitta). In support of his position he quotes the Locana :

'Caturvarga vyutpatterapica ānanda eva

pāryantikaṁ mukhyaṁ phalam' [8]

It can be said that this introductory portion of the work is an important contribution of Vidyānāthā to literary criticism in Sanskrit. Though the classification of the definition of the Nayakas and Nāyikās are found elsewhere in the Alānkāra works, the importance of choice of an ideal Nāyaka for the piece of literature is not so much stressed or elaborately discussed in them.

The Pratāparudrīya is an eclictic treatise bringing in the several concepts of literary criticism. Thus Alankāraśāstrasarvasva - all that forms the subject matter of Alaṅkārasastra finds a place there. The concepts of Rasa, Guṇa, Alankara, Rītī and Vrtti have all been dealt with. The concepts like Paka and Śayyā are also discussed. Rasa is considered to be the principal concept.

In this connection Kumārasvāmin explains the popular name

'Alaṅkārasāstra' for the science of literary criticism in Sanskrit. Alankara is one of the concepts. Yet the discipline is called Alaṅkārasāstra. The designation can be justified by the maxim of 'Cchatrin' since Alankaras received greater attention in the works of literary criticism the discipline itself came to be called Alaṅkārasāstra - the science of Alankaras [9]. It could be explained also with reference to the signification of the term Alankāra given by Vamana.

'Saundaryamalaṅkāraḥ'

Alaṅkāra is literary beauty. The science dealing with the different factors contributing to literary beauty came to be known as Alaṅkārasāstra.

Keeping in view the practice of the writers Vidyānātha offers his salutations to Bhamāha who is considered as the earliest author of Alaṅkārasāstra. Although Bharata in his Nāṭyasāstra speaks of certain factors like Rasa, Alankara, Guna, Dosa etc., that stand common to both the varieties of Poetry - Dṛsya and Śravya, Nāṭyasastra is generally held in high esteem as a treatise on dance and drama whereas Bhamaha's Kāvyalānkāra is considered as the first treatise on Alankarasastra.

Vidyānātha divides his text Prataparudrīya into nine Prakaranas, viz., Nayaka, Kavya, Nataka, Rasa, Dosa, Guṇa, Śabdālaṅkāra, Arthalāṅkāra and Miśrālaṅkāra Prakaranas. Now let us examine his first Prakaraṇa, i.e., Nāyakaprakarana in which the nature, types and attributes of the Nāyaka as well as Nāyikā and their associates are described.

CHAPTER - I

NĀYAKA PRAKARAṆA

The etymological meaning of the word 'Nāyaka', according to Kumārasvāmin is *'Nayati prāpnoti, vṛttam phalam ceti nāyakaḥ'* [1]. One who leads the action of the story and attains its fruit is called a Nāyaka. Vidyānātha at the outset, says that Mahākulīnatā (Exalted lineage), Aujjvalyam (Beautiful appearance), Mahābhāgyam (Prosperity), Udāratā (Magnanimity), Tejasvitā (Resplendence), Vaidagdhyam (Dexterity), Dhārmikatva (Dutifulness) Mahāmahimatva (Divinity), Pāṇḍitya (Scholarship) etc., are some of the qualities [2] that go to make a person the hero of a Kāvya. It is to be noted that the qualities like lineage and appearance are acquired by birth where as the qualities like nobility and scholarship are to be cultivated.

The qualities of a hero are enumerated differently by different scholars. Rudraṭa in his Kāvyālankāra enumerates these qualities as sixteen [3] whereas the Śṛṅgāratilaka speaks of twelve [4]. Out of the sixteen qualities enunciated by Rudraṭa, only four viz., Kulīnatā, Sampatti, Ujjvalaveṣa and Dakṣatā can be correlated with the qualities mentioned by Vidyānātha, i.e.,Mahākulīnatā, Mahābhagya, Aujjvalya and Vaidagdhya respectively though the terms differ. According to Bhoja the qualities of the hero are twelve [5]. Hemacandra on the other hand speaks of eight [6] whereas in the Vāgbhatālaṅkāra we find nine [7]. Again in Vāgbhaṭa's Kāvyānuśāsana we have as many as twenty seven covetable accomplishments of a hero [8]. Keśavamiśra in his Alaṅkāraśekhara mentions eight [9] qualities while Dhanañjaya in his Daśarūpaka shows us twenty two [10]. Viśvanātha in his Sāhityadarpana gives them as twelve but he adds eight more under the head of Sāttvikaguṇas [11]. In Rasārṇavasudhākara Siṅgabhūpāla explains fifteen characteristics [12] whereas Sarveśvara in his Sāhityasāra confines himself to eight [13]. Amṛtānandayogin also considers them as eight [14] Śrīkṛṣṇakavi adds profundity of character, sympathetic

temperament, sense of emulation and purity to the qualities of a hero that are generally accepted [15]. Guṇacandra achieves still greater brevity in speaking that a hero is one who possesses the prominent virtues, neither vicious nor befallen in calamities, though he speaks of eight Sāttvikaguṇas [16].

The heroes are again enumerated as four types as Udātta, Uddhata, Lalita and Śānta with the prefix of 'Dhīra', from the viewpoint of stamina which is endorsed by all the Ālaṅkārikas except Acyutarāya who has not considered Uddhata type in his Sāhityasāra. *'Tredhā netā prakīrtitaḥ'* [17]. Lastly heroes are treated as four types namely Anukūla, Dakṣiṇa, Śaṭha, and Dhṛṣṭa.

Nāyaka in general is said to possess these qualities : to be known for his fame and valour, to be interested in the three human ends, viz., Dharma, Artha and Kāma; and capable of being equipped with all good qualities. Vidyānātha says that it has already been mentioned that the divisions of Nāyakas are Dhīrodātta, Dhīroddhata, Dhīralalita and Dhīraśānta by earlier writers. Bharata in his Nāṭyaśāstra mentions that only gods are Dhīroddhatas whereas the kings should be considered as Dhīralalitas, ministers and commanders are Dhīrodāttas while Brahmins and merchants are Dhīraśāntas [18]. But this division is only broad based. Though Bharata prescribes such a rule, it seems to have been observed more in its violation. In this connection Kumārasvāmin observes that the number of Nāyakas that may occur in the context of Śṛṅgāra is forty eight [19], basing upon the innate nature of the Nāyakas, the relationship they hold with the Nāyikās and their cultural status. It is also suggested that this division applies for the sentiments of Vīra, Raudra, Śṛṅgāra and Śānta. Speaking of Dhīraśānta Vidyānātha says :

'Dhīraśśāntaḥ prasannātmā dhīraśānto dvijādikaḥ' [20]

Commenting upon this definition, Kumārasvāmin suggests that

ministers and businessmen could be taken by the word 'Ādi', which is in agreement with the definition of Bharata. He also quotes :

'Sāmānyaguṇayuktastu dhīraśānto dvijādika iti kecit' [21]

By the word 'Kecit' the authors of Daśarūpaka and Sāhityadarpana are intended. Vidyānātha also gives the characteristics of the supporters or assistants of the Nāyaka. They are of four types, viz., Pīṭhamarda (Attender), Viṭa (Parasite), Ceṭa (a friend) and Vidūṣaka (Jester). We can take Sugrīva in Rāmāyaṇa as Pīṭhamarda, Śekharaka in Nāgānanda as a Viṭa. Ceṭa is a shrewd person in bringing about the union of the hero and the heroine where as Vidūṣaka is a court jester mainly intended to create fun. After defining the qualities of the hero and his supporters, Vidyānātha enunciates the Nāyikās as eight types, viz., Svādhīnapatikā, Vāsakasajjikā, Virahotkaṇṭhitā, Vipralabdhā, Khaṇḍitā, Kalahāntaritā, Proṣitabhartṛkā and Abhisārikā.

The general characteristics of Nāyaka have been earlier enunciated. Vidyānātha has not mentioned any such characteristics in the case of a Nāyikā. Here it may be inferred that those which have been prescribed in the case of a Nāyakā apply even in the case of Nāyikā [22]. So we do not find Vidyānathā mentioning the general characteristics of a Nāyikā.

Bharata is the first of the available writers to speak of different types of Nāyikās. The latter treatises such as Rudrata's Kāvyalankāra, Dhanañjaya's Daśarūpaka, Śāradātanaya's Bhāvaprakāśa, Viśvanātha's Sāhityadarpaṇa and Bhānudatta's Rasamañjari have simply followed the concept of Bharata regarding the different varieties of Nāyikās.

Some of the Ālaṅkārikas treat the eight varieties as specific types of the heroines though authors like Vāgbhaṭa expressly state that these eight are states of women.[23] This seems to be more acceptable because these states may occur in a woman's life at different stages

though not all. So we can conclude that these stages of life may possibly be experienced by woman in general and there is no hard and fast rule that everybody should pass through all these stages.

Bhojarāja says about Nāyikā, Pratināyikā, Upanāyikā and the Anunāyikās.[24] Further divisions have also been given as follows :

According to qualities	: Uttamā, Madhyamā and Adhamā
According to age and talent	: Mugdhā, Madhyamā and Pragalbhā
According to chivalry	: Dhīrā and Adhīrā; and
According to Parigraha	: Svīyā and Anyadīyā.

In the Sarasvatī kaṇṭhābharaṇa they are considered as of 32 types.[25] Viśvanātha enumerates the types of heroines as 384 and further states that the number may still exceea.[26]

However, Vidyānātha does not go into such de.ails but restricts himself, by giving the eight varieties of Nāyikās depending upon their nature and three varieties, Mugdhā, Madhyā and Prauḍhā on the basis of their age and talent of her amatorial activities.

Out of the eight types of Śṛṅgāranāyikās the first variety is Svādhīnapatikā. The woman who is constantly coaxed by her beloved is designated as Svādhīnapatikā. Bharata's explanation is that the Nāyakā is captivated by Nāyikā by her amarous pleasures and stays by her side [27]. Dhanañjaya follows suit [28]. Though there is no variance in concept, the definition of Vidyānātha is more plain, when he says :

'Priyopalālitā nityam Svādhīnapatikā matā' [29]

The definition of Viśvanātha and others, however, show verbal difference only, spirit being the same [30].

While explaining the term Vāsakasajjikā Kumārasvāmin in his commentary makes two different observations. According to one, Vāsaka means the place of abode. According to the other it means the appointed day. He, however, observes that Vidyānātha follows the second one. When we closely study the definition and illustration given by Vidyānātha for Vāsakasajjikā one fails to appreciate the remark of Kumārasvāmin that Vidyānātha follows the second interpretation, for, both of these interpretations can be accommodated in the definition given by Vidyānātha. The second variety is named as Vāsakasajjikā, who decorates herself as well as the bed room on the day of the appointment of her darling. While the definitions of Bharata, Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha speak of the lady decorating herself, [31] the definitions of Rudraṭa, Śāradātanaya, Bhānudatta and Vidyānātha fall in a line in saying that she decorates herself as well as the bedroom. [32] Dhanika, the commentator on Daśarūpaka also agrees with them. [33]

Vidyānātha defines the third variety, Virahotkaṇṭhitā as follows :

'Cirayatyadhikam kānte virahotkaṇṭhitonmanāḥ' [34]

The woman who is distressed by the delay of her darling is described as Virahotkaṇṭhitā. Bharata attributes the cause 'engagements' for the delay on the part of Nāyaka [35]. Dhanañjaya while following suit, ascribes the quality of blemishlessness to Nāyaka also, perhaps to gain the sympathy of the spectator and as such the definition of Dhanañjaya is more explanatory than that of Vidyānātha in view of the attribute employed in his definition, viz., 'Avyalike' [36].

Coming to the fourth variety, Vipralabdhā, Vidyānātha defines a woman as Vipralabdhā who is deceived by her lover who promises to meet her at an appointed place[37]. Bharata opines that she is the lady whose lover does not turn up for some cause inspite of the tryst or the message through a female messenger [38]. Dhanañjaya observes

that Nāyikā takes the absence of Nāyaka as an insult [39]. Though the spirit is the same in the definitions of Dhanañjaya and Vidyānātha, a slight difference can be traced in their concepts depending upon their words Vañcitā and Ativimānitā. Thus the name gains greater propriety in the definition of Vidyānātha than in that of Dhanañjaya. In the footsteps of Bharata, Rudraṭa is also not clear whether the Nāyikā feels insulted or not [40].

The fifth variety is Khaṇḍitā. According to Vidyānātha Khaṇḍitā is one who is angry by the sight of the signs which signify that her lover has spent the previous night with some other woman [41]. Bharata does not give us any special feature of this type as distinguished from that of Virahotkaṇṭhitā [42]. It is not evident even in Rudraṭa [43]. Dhanañjaya, however, brings sharp contrast between Virahotkaṇṭhitā and Khaṇḍitā. He speaks of Khaṇḍitā as one who is jealous towards the Pratināyikā[44] while Vidyānātha simply observes that she is angry with Nāyaka [45].

The sixth type is Kalahāntaritā. According to Vidyānātha Kalahāntaritā is a type of heroine who first insults her lover on account of her anger and repents afterwards [46]. There is a marked difference in the concept of Kalahāntaritā as conceived by Bharata on the one hand and the later writers on the other [47]. While Bharata does not speak of repentence on the part of the Nāyikā, later writers mention it.

The Proṣitabhartṛkā is the seventh type. The Nāyikā who is dejected when her lover leaves for some other place comes under this type. However, there is no marked difference in the concept of this type among the Ālaṅkārikas [48].

The Abhisārikā comes under the last and the eighth variety. While dealing with this type Vidyānātha states that the lady who is prepared to go for her lover, having been afflicted by amarous desires is designated as Abhisārikā [49]. Bharata observes that she is a lady, who

out of love and infatuation, sends forth a messenger in order that she may cause the Nāyaka come to her [50]. Later writers headed by Dhanañjaya appear to opine that a lady who by herself goes to the dwelling of her darling for dalliance comes to be categorised as Abhisārikā [51]. Śaradātanaya in his Bhāvaprakāśa, however, literally follows what has been said by Bharata in this connection [52]. According to Dhanañjaya, either the lady who goes to her lover or who makes him to come to her - both should be designated as Abhisārikās [53]. It is to be noted that in both the cases the initiative comes from the lady in love.

Kumārasvāmin explaining the definition of Vidyānātha *'Kāntābhisaraṇodyuktā smarārta sābhisārikā'* says:

'Kāntasya karmaṇaḥ karturvā 'bhisaraṇe udyuktā' [54]

which interpretation results in conveying both the kinds of Ābhisārikās shown by Dhanañjaya. He takes the support of Dhanañjaya in this connection. Viśvanātha goes into further details and describes Ābhisārikā under three types according to their social status, viz., a family woman, a concubine and a servant maid [55]. Bhānudatta categorises three types based on the time factor. According to him Jyotsnābhisārikā is one who goes for her lover in moonlit nights. Tamisrābhisārikā is one who goes to her lover in darkness. The third, who seeks for her lover in day time is known as Divasābhisārikā [56].

Śāradātanayā further classifies these eight types into three kinds as Uttamā, Madhyamā and Adhama [57]. Bhānudatta adds one more variety to the generally accepted eight varieties by name Proṣyatpatikā, thus making the total nine. He defines it as :

'Deśāntaraniścitagamane preyasi proṣyatpatikā'pi navamī nāyikā bhavitumarhati' [58]

If according to Bhānudatta the heroine whose hero proposes to

leave in future for a foreign land is to be considered as the ninth variety, then there is the contingency of a tenth variety coming into picture in the case of the heroine whose hero is presently to leave for another country. Such classification on flimsy grounds like these is, however, to be discouraged as there is no special charm coming in as a consquence of such classification.

Vidyānātha observes that other varieties like Padminī etc., can be known from the Kāmaśāstra [59] as they are not very important in the discussion of literary criticism. He follows the proper order and propriety in discussing and devoting a special chapter for the definitions of the heroes and the heroines and their illustrations of their different characteristics which is in consonance with his theory that the prestige and popularity of a particular composition depends upon the hero described in it.

CHAPTER II

KĀVYA PRAKARAṆA

Vidyānātha deals with different factors of Poetry in Kāvya Prakaraṇa. At the outset he defines Poetry as an assemblage of sound and sense, bereft of blemishes and endowed with excellences and poetic figures [1]. As regards the definition of Poetry, Vidyānātha considers that both sound and sense constitute Poetry. Evidently he is following Mammaṭa here. This definition, however, is later criticised by Jagannātha, the celebrated authority on Poetics, purely on the lines of logic. In this connection, it is necessary to keep in view that Vidyānātha's scheme in wirting this work is simply to introduce the principles of literary criticism to the reader, but not to enter into a debate in detail and delve deep into the intricacies.

Daṇḍin states that even a small blemish hampers the beauty of Poetry just as a single mark of leprosy spoils the beauty of person [2]. Perhaps this view of Daṇḍin would have prompted Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha to employ the epithet Adoṣau in the definition of Poetry. But this epithet Adoṣau meets with the serious objection of Jagannātha, for it is evident that even Poetry which is considered as belonging to the finest variety is not free from blemishes. For instance, the verse "Nyakkāro 'hyayameva" etc. [3] is considered as a fitting illustration for Dhvanikāvya by cultured critics, despite the fact that there is the defect 'Avimṛṣṭavidheyamśa' in it. The universal usage "Duṣṭam Kāvyam" comes to be set aside if the definition of Poetry as given by Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha is adhered to.

Vidyānātha then observes that Poetry is threefold, Gadya, Padya, and Campū. It appears that Vidyānātha is of the view that Dramas can come under the third type, i.e., Campūkavya. However, the proper classification would be to treat Poetry first under two varieties, Śravya and Dṛśya. Under the Śravya type of Poetry, these three varieties, Gadya, Padya and Campū deserve mention.

Summing up the concepts of earlier writers regarding the different elements of Poetry, Vidyānātha composes four Kārikas beginning with "Śabdārthau" etc. [4] He opines that the sound and sense constitute the body of Poetry whereas the suggested sense is its very life. The figures like Simile are like the ornaments to a person. The Śleṣa (Coaloscence) etc., are the qualities as the valour etc., in the case of a man. The styles or Rītis are just like the nature that glorify the soul. The modes of diction or Vṛttis are like the artificial manners that enhance the beauty of an individual. Mutual agreeability in the setting of words is called Śayyā in poetry and it is like the bed on which one likes to rest himself. The Pāka or fruition helps relishing the sentiment in different ways. Thus we see the wisdom of the author in bringing out the whole Sāmagri or the elements of Poetry on the analogy of their worldly counterparts.

It is a known fact that a word has three functions, viz., Abhidhā (Denotative), Lakṣaṇā (Secondary) and Vyañjanā (Suggestive). Of these the function that enables a word to give its direct meaning (Vācya) is Abhidhā and the function by virtue of which the meaning of a word is extended (Lakṣya) is Lakṣaṇā. Where a third sense different from Vācya and Lakṣya emerges there we have to postulate a new function Vyañjana which rhetoracians only accept. Vidyānātha denies the possibility of a fourth function called Tātparya which has been accepted by the followers of the Bhāṭṭa school of Mimamsa. He, however, includes this function under Vyañjana itself.

Abhidhā is of two kinds, viz., Rūḍhipūrvikā and Yogapūrvikā. In Rūḍhipūrvikā the meaning of the components in a particular word get eclipsed and a different meaning which has nothing to do with the meaning of the components becomes prominent by current usage. Kumārasvāmin illustrates it by the example of 'Aśvakarṇa' [5]. There are actually two components in the word 'Aśvakarṇa' – 'Aśva' and Karṇa'. The word 'Aśva' means 'a horse' and 'Karna' means 'an ear'. Thus we have the meaning of the 'Ear of the horse' as its surface meaning. But 'Aśvakarṇa' is a famous herb. As the meaning of a particular herb by that name is so popular, one understands it as that particular herb as

soon as he hears the word 'Aśvakarṇa'. It is evident that the usage of this kind are numerous in any language. Vidyānātha illustrates this in a verse composed by him :

'Tapoviśeṣaiḥ prathitaiḥ prajānām

śubhaiścaritrairjagatīmahiṣyaḥ I

Bhagyaiḥ prabhūtairbhuvanasya cāsya

bibharti rājyam varavīrarudraḥ' II [6]

All the words in the above verse have Rūḍhyartha (established meaning) having no reference to the Yaugikārtha (etymological sense). In the word 'Prajānām' though there is a meaning for the components also according to the dictum "Rūḍhiryogamapaharati" one has to take the word 'Prajā' in the sense of people only and not in the sense of whatever is profusely born.

The power of words in conveying the meaning based upon the meanings of its components is called Yogapūrvikābhidhā. In this verse[7] the words 'Rājñī', 'Vasumatī' and 'Ratnagarbhā' give the sense conveyed by their components.

Coming to Lakṣaṇā, Vidyānātha explains it as follows : If the expressed sense conveyed by the primary function is incongruent then we have to take resort to a secondary function called Lakṣaṇā in order to remove that incongruity. However, it may be questioned here as to the propriety of Lakṣaṇā being a word Śabdavyāpāraḥ (function). The following may be given as an explanation. A particular word which is employed in a particular context becomes ineffective after giving the denotative sense by the oft quoted dictum *'Sakṛduccāritaśśabdaḥ sakṛdevārtham gamayati'* . So it does not have the capacitty of conveying some other sense. Such being the case how far it is proper to designate Lakṣaṇā as a Śabdavyāpāra? Here it has to be said that though Lakṣaṇā is essentially a function related to the sense it is attributed to the word in order to cross over the above said difficulty.

The relationships that are primarily responsible for Lakṣaṇā are said differently by the different scholars. Bhartṛhari says that these relationships are five fold as Sambandha, Sādṛsya, Samavāya, Vaiparītya and Kriyāsaṁyoga.[8] In Nyāyadarśana they are enumerated as ten, viz., Sāhacarya, Sthāna, Tādarthya, Vṛtta, Māna, Dhāraṇa, Sāmīpya, Yoga, Sādhana and Ādhipatya.[9] Nāgeśabhaṭṭa in his Parmalaghumañjuṣā[10] gives them as five, viz., Tāṭasthya, Taddharmya, Tatsāmīpya, Tatsāhacarya and Tādarthya.

In the Kāvyaprakāśa, Lakṣaṇā is mainly divided into two categories as Śuddhā and Gauṇī, in which Sāropopādanalakṣaṇā, Sādhyavasāyopādanalakṣaṇā, Sāropalakṣaṇalakṣaṇā and Sādhyavasāyalakṣaṇalakṣaṇā come under Śudha type and Sāropagauṇī and Sādhyavasāyagauṇī fall under Gauṇī.[11]

In the Vṛttivārtika also there is a broad division of Lakṣaṇā into two categories with the names of Gauṇī and Śuddha. While Nirūḍha, Phalalaksaṇāropā and Phalalakṣana sādhyavasāya fall under the former head, Nirūḍhā, Phalalakṣaṇa saropa, Phalalakṣaṇā sādhyavasāyā, Jahallakṣaṇā, Ajahallakṣaṇā and Jahadajahallakṣaṇā come under the latter.[12]

In the Rasagaṅgādhara we find the broad categorisation of Nirūḍhalakṣaṇā and Phalalakṣaṇā. In the latter we have the two subdivisions – Gauṇī and Śuddhā. Gauṇī has two types by name Sāropā and Sādhyavasāya and the Śuddhā has four types by name Jahatsvārthā, Ajahatsvārthā, Sāropā and Sādhyavasāyā.[13]

Viśvanātha in his Sāhityadarpaṇa categorised Lakṣaṇā under two main categories as Rūḍhimūlā and Prayojanamūlā. The Rūḍhimula is again divided as Śuddhā and Gauṇī. According to him Upādānalakṣaṇa, Lakṣaṇalakṣaṇā, Sāropā and Sādhyavasāya are the subdivisions of Śudhā and the above four varieties of Śuddhā with the relationship of Guṇa are said to be Gauṇī. In Prayojanamula the four varieties of the Śuddhā above come under Śuddhā type as in the case of Rūḍhimūlā and as such they are called as Śuddha prayojanamūlā

and the four varieties of Gauṇī are designated as Gauṇī prayojanamūlā, with a total number of eight subdivisions. These eight types of Lakṣaṇā under the sub head of Prayojanamūlā become sixteen by the criteria of Vyaṅgya being Gūḍha and Agūḍha. Again the Prayojana (Purpose) accruing the Dharmin or Dharma they expand to thirty two types. With the addition of the eight ancillaries of Rūḍhimula they become forty. And again these forty types, on account of their being based on word and sentence become eighty.[14] Out of these eighty Viśvanātha mentions such varieties where the suggested sense is sometimes clear and sometimes not clear. These bases, however, deserve consideration while one deals with the varieties of suggested sense and not those of Lakṣaṇā.

Vidyānātha is very brief and mentions only four varieties of Lakṣaṇā, viz., Jahallakṣaṇā, Ajahallakṣaṇā, Sāropalakṣaṇā and Sādhyavasāyalakṣaṇā. As the basis of Lakṣaṇā and Gauṇavṛtti is the same he does not find any justification in treating them as separate. Therefore he includes Gauṇavṛitti in Lakṣaṇā with a remark that it is one of the different types of Lakṣaṇā.[15]

The third function Vyañjana is defined by Vidyānātha as one which has for its object a third sense (different from Vācya and Lakṣya) intended to embellish the primary sense. This is of three types in view of the fact that it is based upon a particular word, sense or both. The verse "Vāhinyaḥ" etc.,[16] provides an illustration for the first variety. Here there arises a question to be answered. Can a sentence give out two senses, one depending upon the primary function and the other on suggestion? Vidyānātha observes that it is a defect in the case of Vedic literature and not in the case of worldly literature. In the world we find sentences may have different shades of meaning upon the intention of the speaker. Hence for a sentence to propound two senses is no defect in Kāvya literature.

For the second variety the verse "Śrutvā kākatibhūbhartuḥ" etc.[17] is an illustration. Here Vidyānātha clarifies his position that

Arthaśaktimūladhvani cannot be included under Anumāna. While Anumāna has its life in the Vyāpti or invariable concomitance, Vyañjana has no such restriction. Hence the difference between Anumāna and Vyañjana.

According to Mīmāmsakas the three types of senses, Vācya, Lakṣya and Vyaṅgya could be got only by a single word function Abhidhā. Here they bring in the analogy of a strong hero piercing the armour skin and heart of his opponent with a single arrow forcefully discharged. Similarly, according to them, a single word aptly used by a great poet can convey all the above three senses with a single power, namely, Abhidhā. Vidyānātha sets aside this argument by observing that Abhidhā can only give the contextual sense and becomes ineffective afterwards. If the above view of Mīmāmsakas is accepted then even the secondary function, i.e., Lakṣaṇā loses ground. This is, however, an undesirable contingency. Hence to accept a third word function is proper.

The third variety is seen illustrated in the verse "Vijitāripura" etc.[18] Here both sound and sense are suggestors and the suggested sense is that Pratāparudra is like Śiva. Hence it can be taken as an instance of the suggestion of the figure of simile by means of a fact (Vastunā upamalaṅkāradhvani).

Mammaṭa while classifying the sense observes that Tātparyārtha according to some (Bhāṭṭamīmāmsakas) has to be reckoned as the fourth variety of sense different from Vācya, Lakṣya and Vyaṅgya.[19] Vidyānātha, however, sets aside even this partial view and includes Tātparyārtha under suggested sense itself. He emphatically denies its being a separate sense.[20] It is well-known that there are two schools of thought among Mīmāsakas and one of them accepts Tātparyaśakti in order to help the comprehension of sentence meaning. For them the Tātparyārtha in the statements like "Rāmaḥ vanam gacchati" is that there is the activity of going to the forest whose agent is Rāma and the object is the forest. This evidently cannot be taken as the suggested

sense. The statement of Vidyānātha that both Tātparyārtha and Vyaṅgyārtha are the same remains to be substantiated.

In this connection Kumārasvāmi Somapīthin explains the stand of Vidyānātha. He observes that in order to arrive at the sentence meaning one need not accept a separate function called Tātparya but the juxtaposition of the words having the mutual expectancy is itself sufficient. Hence to accept Tātparya, a fourth function is prolixious. Here Vidyānātha follows the view of the logicians. According to them the statements like *'Pariṇati virasam panasaphalam'* and *'Pariṇati sarasam āmraphalam'* have the Tātparyārtha in abandoning and receiving respectively. This evidently is not the expressed sense of the sentence. It is only the intended sense of the speaker. We can understand the spirit of the statement of Vidyānātha though it appears to differ from the view presented in the Kāvyaprakāśa. It can be defended following the school of logicians. Even in the Devatādhikaraṇa of Vyāsa it is said that when there is no Tātparyārtha different from the sense got by Samsarga, then the Samsargārtha itself can be taken as Tātparyārtha. This, however, does not happen in all cases: For instance, in the above quoted sentences we find Tātparyārtha is quite different from the sense got by Samsarga. In such cases Tātparyārtha is not to be confused with the sense got by Samsarga.

There are four other types of Vṛttis that are discussed by the literary critics, while the earlier writers like Bharata, Dhanañjaya, etc. explained in the context of Drama, Vidyānātha speaks of them in connection with the Śravyakāvya. Vidyānātha is very clear in this respect in dividing the Vṛttis into two categories naming Śabdavṛttis and Arthavṛttis. He has already spoken of Śabdavṛttis Abhidhā Lakṣaṇā and Vyañjanā, and comes to the Arthavṛttis, Kaiśikī, Ārabhaṭī, Sāttvati and Bhāratī. He also warns that one should not confuse these Arthavṛttis with Śabdavṛttis as these are the indicators of Rasāvasthāna. But these Vṛttis are the characteristic features of the Racanā (collocation) intimately connected with the different stages of sentiments that are depicted in the Kāvya. He also quotes a verse -

'Kaiśikyārabhaṭicaiva Sāttvatī Bhāratī tathā catasro Vṛttayojñeyā rasāvasthāna sūcakāḥ' .[21]

Though he says that this verse is from Daśarūpaka it is not found in it. Instead, we see the same verse appears twice in Rudraṭa's Śṛṅgāratilaka.[22] In this connection it is again interesting to note that in the K.P. Trivedi's edition of the Pratāparudrīya it is "tathācoktam" only where in all the other editions the text is "tathācoktam Daśarūpake".

The concept of Vṛtti seems to have more than one form in the writings of the earlier writers. Dhanañjaya in his Daśarūpaka clearly mentions that Vṛtti is of the form of the activity of the hero.

'Tadvyāpāratmikāvṛttiḥ' [23]

As regards Kaiśikī he observes that it is tender on account of amarous gestures, dance and singing.[24] It is also said that Kaiśikī possesses four ancillaries. Similarly Sāttvatī also denotes the behaviour of the hero characterised by strength, valour, charity, compassion and happiness.[25] It too has been spoken of as having four varieties. Similarly Ārabhaṭī consists of magic, conjuration, conflict, rage, frenzy etc., with four ancillaries.[26] Bhāratī does not have any ancillaries as it is a common one. Dhanañjaya, however, brings in the association of Vṛttis with different sentiments. He observes that Kaiśikī suits Śṛṅgāra while Sāttvatī is adoptable in the case of the heroic sentiment. Ārabhaṭī, however, is the Vṛtti to be taken up in connection with the sentiments Ràudra and Bībhatsa, whereas Bhārati is a common Vrtti applicable in all cases.[27]

According to Bharata, Bhāratī is the Vṛtti where in there is prominence for the utterances of the hero and they should be men only. It should be presented only in Sanskrit and the names of the actors should occur in it.[28] Similar stipulations are there in the case of Sāttvativṛtti also. It is characterised by abundance of bliss, absence of sorrow and equanimity of behaviour.[29] Kaiśikī stands in contrast to Bhāraṭī in as much as women can be associated here. It deals with

amarous enjoyments and gaudy attire. Music and dance also form a part of this Vṛtti.[30] Finally Ārabhaṭī deals with speeches filled with falsehood and boastfulness (Dambha). Hypocracy also finds place here. For these Vṛttis Bharata also gives subdivisions.[31] Thus we find Bharata. Dhanañjaya and Vidyānātha have different concepts of Vṛtti.

Vidyānātha distinguishes the Rītis Vaidarbhī etc., from the Vṛttis Kaiśikī etc., He observes that the former do not require a particular type of sense to be described. They simply depend upon the word excellences. Hence their classification is based upon the tenderness and hardness of the compositions. The Vṛttis Kaiśikī etc., however, require a particular sense for depiction. Vidyānātha observes that Kaiśikī suits the sentiments Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa. Ārabhaṭī, however, is applicable in the sentiments of Raudra and Bībhatsa. Bhāratī is the composition suitable to Hāsya, Śānta and Adbhuta. Finally, Sāttvatī has to be related to the sentiments Vīra and Bhayānaka.[32] In this connection we can note certain deviations made by Vidyānātha. According to Dhanañjaya Kaiśikī is suitable only to Śṛṅgāra. Regarding Karuṇa, Hāsya, Adbhuta, Śānta and Bhayānaka he does not mention any specific rīti to be employed, but makes a general statement that Bhāratī is applicable to all sentiments. Vidyānātha, however, speaks of two more Vṛttis, Madhyamārabhaṭī and Madhyamakaiśikī which could be traced in Bhoja's Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa.[33] According to Vidyānātha these two types of compositions can be employed in the case of any sentiment. He defines Madhyamakaiśikī as -

'Mṛdvarthe 'pyanati prauḍhabandha madhyamakaiśikī' [34]

Thus according to him, even while depicting tender ideas like Śṛṅgāra one can employ not too hard a composition which he designates as Madhyamakaiśikī. Similarly Madhyamārabhaṭī is the case where, even in the sentiments like Raudra, the composition is not too soft.

'Madhyamārabhaṭī prauḍhepyarthenātimṛdukramā' [35]

This kind of adjustment regarding compositions, however, is necessary since no poet appears to have strictly adhered to the restrictions of Vṛttis laid down by the earlier writers. Defining the different Rītis (Styles) Vidyānātha makes it very clear once again that there is absolutely no similarity between the Rītis and Vṛttis as the former is concerned only with Mādhurya etc., which belong to the stratum of the sound where as the latter is Rasavyañjaka having reference to the sense.

Regarding the enumeration of Rītis, Ālaṅkārikas have different views. The famous Vaidarbhī, Gauḍī, Pāñcālī Rītis are accepted by Vāmana, Vāgbhaṭa II and Rājaśekhara though he names them as Komalā, Kaṭhinā and Miśramā. Vāgbhata I, Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha accepts only two out of the above three, viz., Vaidarbhī and Gauḍī without taking Pāñcālī into consideration. But some critics hold that Bhāmaha accepts three Rītis including Pāñcālī.[36] Ānandavardhana discredits the theory of Rītis of Vāmana which arises due to an incapacity to comprehend the suggestive nature of Poetry. He just recognises in its stead the two kinds of Vṛttis resting in Śabda and Artha. Mammaṭa, however, considers that the Rītis of Vāmana are the same as the Śabdavṛttis - Upanāgarikā etc. Rājaśekhara defines it as a mode of expression. Ānandavardhana, though enumerates the Rītis as three, names them as Upanāgarikā, Paruṣā and Komalā. Kuntaka's naming again differs as Sukumāra, Vicitra and Madhyama. Rudraṭa and Viśvanātha adds one more to the Vaidarbhī, Gauḍī and Pāñcālī by name Lāṭī.[37] Prakāśavarṣa adds still one more to these four by name Avantikā making them five.[38] Bhoja adds again one more to these five by name Māgadhī which results in six.[39] However, Vidyānātha accepts the famous three, Vaidarbhī, Gauḍī and Pāñcālī.

The Vaidarbhī is named after the province, as the people of that part are particularly interested in it. It is said to be the elegant more of expression (Lalitātmikā) and as such it consists of sweet sounds. It is said to be possessed of ten excellences. The presence of the excellences Prasāda and Mādhurya could be evidently seen in this

which is suited to the delineation of soft feelings and as such it can be employed in Śṛṅgāra and Hāsya. Thus it goes hand in hand with Kaiśikī. The second Gauḍīya stands in contrast to the first one which possesses only two, Ojas and Kānti. As this style is favoured by the inhabitants of the Gauḍa region it is named after them. It consists of long compounds and hard consonants. As Vidyānātha says that it possesses the excellences of Ojas one can understand that it is verbose and full of alliterations.[40] It is fit for the description of the sentiments Furious and Heroic and agrees with Sāttvati and Ārabhaṭi Vṛttis. In the same way the third Pāñcālī also possesses two, Mādhurya and Saukumārya. Like the above two it is named after the people of Pāñcāla region who like it. It is an admixture of the above two. It agrees with the Kaiśikī and the Bhāratī Vṛttis and to some extent Sāttvati. Possibly influenced by Daṇḍin and Vāmana, Rudraṭa advocates four types of styles, Pāñcālī, Lāṭīyā, Gauḍīyā and Vaidarbhī. Pāñcālī is characterised by short, Lāṭīyā by medium and Gauḍīyā by long compounds, and Vaidarbhī is marked by an absolute absence of compounds. While Vaidarbhī is endowed with grace and lucidity the Gauḍīyā prefers grandeur and verbosity.

It is Vidyānātha who has successfully fixed the nebulous concept of Śayyā in literary criticism. Etymologically, the term Śayyā means bed. On the same analogy Vidyānātha describes Śayyā as the repose of words in their mutual favourableness like the repose of the body in a bed.

'Padānuguṇyaviśrāntiḥ Śayyā Śayyetikathyate' [41]

We see the earliest usage of this term in Bāṇa's Kādambarī.[42] As there is some sort of Śabdālaṅkāra in Śayyā, Agnipurāṇa calls it as Mudra.[43] Bhoja mentions a particular Śayyā as one of the Śabdālaṅkāras which he defines -

'Śayyetyāhuḥ padārthānāṁ ghaṭanāyāṁ parasparam' [44]

But, as Dr. Raghavan observes, "there has been no consistent tradition or association of precise ideas with this concept in the history of poetics".[45] The concepts of Śayyā and Pāka can be taken as twin concepts because the former is related to the Sound whereas the latter pertains to the Sense. It is evident that the earlier writers did not deal with them as clearly and as cleverly Vidyānātha deals with them, for he says -

'Yā padānām parā anyonyamaitrī śayyeti kathyate' [46]

Illustrating the concept in his own verse, he also observes *'Atra padavinimayāsahiṣṇutvād bandhasya padānuguṇyarūpā śayyā.'*[47] "That is from the viewpoint of cohesiveness, flow and agreement of the component sounds there should be a uniform and not discordant sequence of word's.[48] Thus the literary value of Śayyā can be assessed where meaning reposes in the tissue of words while each word itself finds a perfect embeding in the integral tissue. In this connection it is to be noted the special emphasis of the word *'Parā anyonya maitrī'* used in the definition of Vidyānātha. In Śayyā the synonyms have no place to replace the words. Following Vidyānātha, Mallinātha explains Śayyā in his commentary "Taralā" on Ekāvalī as follows : *'Padānām parivṛtti vaimukhyam vinimaya 'sahiṣṇutvam etadeva Śayyeticakhyayate'.*[49] In the above explanation the influence of Vidyanatha can be clearly seen. It is to be noted that Viśveśvara follows Vidyānātha while defining the concept of Śayyā when he says

'Śayyā padānāmanyonyamaitrī Vinimayāsaha I

(Sāhityasya) Sahyasya parā kāṣṭhā śayyā desa vibhedataḥ II [50]

Loke prasiddhamityeṣā prājñaiśśayyeti kīrtitā' II

Though Viśveśvara relates the Śayyā to Geographical factors, he does not explain them.The main difference between Śayyā and Rīti is that the former does not allow any substitution of synonyms while in the latter there is room for such a substitution.

After defining Śayyā, the author proceeds to dilate upon Pāka. Like the word Rasa, Pāka is also linked in its etymological derivation which results in well-cooked or ripe. Pāka is defined by Vidyānātha as profundity of meaning.

'Arthagambhīrimā pākaḥ' [51]

But Kumārasvāmin's explanation makes it less powerful when he says that it is a certain type of relishability.

'Āsvadyamanatāviśeṣa' [52]

This explanation, however, reminds the words of Viśveśvara *'Pākaṁ vācāṁ parīpākamāhurāsvādameduram'* [53]

Pāka is first mentioned by Vāmana in this sense. In the context of Vaidarbhīrīti he says :

'Vacasi yamadhiśayyā syandate vacakaśrīḥ

vitathamavitathatvaṁ yatra vastuprayāti I

udayati hi sa tādṛk kvāpi vaidarbhīrītau

sahṛdayahṛdayānāṁ rañjakaḥ ko pi pākaḥ' [54] *II*

Vāmana again defines Pāka as a specific quality which results in the concept of Śayyā of Vidyānātha when he says -

'Yatpadānityajantyeva parivṛtti sahiṣṇutām I

Tamśabdanyasaniṣṇātaḥ śabdapākam pracakṣate' [55] *II*

Bhoja gives the Pāka as a quality of the sound and calls it Praudhi. In the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharana three Pākas are mentioned viz., Nārikelapāka, Mṛdvīpāka and Āmrapāka.[56] Rājaśekhara elaborates them to nine viz., Picumanda, Badara, Mṛdvī, Vārtaka, Tintinīka,Sahakāra, Kramuka, Trapuṣa and Nārikela.[57] Such being

the state of affairs, it is Vidyānātha who makes a clear demarcation between Śayyā and Pāka by assigning the former to sound and the latter to sense. He observes that Pāka attracts the heart which is pregnant with meaning. Thus Pāka is most conducive to the realisation of sentiments. Kumārasvāmin in his commentary gives the meaning of words "Arthasya" and "Gambhīrimā' as 'Śṛṅgārādeḥ' and 'Āsvādyamānatvaviśeṣaḥ'. Vidyādhara in his Ekāvalī explains the term as follows :

"Pākastu rasociata śabdārtha nibandhanam; śravaṇasudhāsyandini padavyutpattiḥ ityanye; padānām parivṛtti vaimukhyaṁ pāka ityapare".[58]

There are three views regarding Pāka. One opines that the assemblage of sounds that are conducive for the Rasa realisation is Pāka. The second variety occurs where the words employed are very sweet to the ear. And according to the third view, Pāka is one which does not entertain any synomyms. From the viewpoint of Vidyānātha the third kind of Pāka is nothing but Śayyā.

Drākṣāpāka, Vidyānātha observes, is regarded as that which is in and out conducive for the delineation of sentiments.[59] Nārikelapāka is one which is pregnant with the sentiment.[60] In Drakṣāpāka the words are so conspecious in presenting their sense that it takes no time to arrive at the sentence meaning. They are easily pronounceable and there would not be any hard juxtapositions. They help in the realisation of Rasa as they enter into one's heart straight away. But in Nārikelapāka the sense is not so easy to grasp. When one works hard just as to drink the water in coconuts, so the Rasa is comprehensible after some pause.

Now Vidyānātha proceeds to discuss the varieties in Poetry. Poetry could be divided into three categories, viz., Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama. The first and the best type of Poetry is called Dhvanikāvya in which the sound and sense having subordinated themselves suggest some other charming sense. Thus in the first type

the suggested idea is more charming and predominant than the expressed one. Vidyānātha presents the following verse as an illustration :

'Svāmin gotra mahīdharankimadhunā nicairvidhatse kuto

gāthānambunidhinkaroṣi? kuruṣe kimaikpatīnalpakān I

ittham pārśvacarānulāpamakhilam nyakkārya dharmaiṣiṇā

sṛṣṭaḥ padmabhuvā guṇaikavasatiśśrīvīrarudro nṛpaḥ' [61] *II*

Here in view of Pratāparudra's greatness the smallness of mountain, ocean etc., has been expressed and the suggested idea is that Pratāparudra excels all in his noble qualities.

The second type of poetry i.e., Guṇībhūtarvyaṅgya is one where the suggested sense is made subservient to the expressed sense.

'Pratyagraprsaratpratāpavibhava vyāptākhilāśāntare

viśvatrātari vīrarudranṛpatau simhāsonādhyāsini I

Āsthānīm samupāgatairnṛpavaraistastastathā darśitā

śceṣṭa yābhiramuṣya kākativibhordṛṣṭiḥ kṛpārdrīkṛtā' [62] *II*

Here the pathetic behaviour of the subordinate kings by way of compassion evoking appeals etc., is suggested. The suggested idea however, is not so charming as the expresed idea which generally speaks of their actions before Pratāparudra. Hence it can be taken as an illustration of the second type of poetry.

The third variety of Poetry of Citrakāvya, however, occurs where the suggested sense is not clear. Vidyānātha gives us a threefold division of this as Śabdacitra, Arthacitra and Ubhayacitra. In Śabdacitra, the main emphasis is only on sound and as such the charm of the expressed sense is sacrificed for the verbal beauty. Though there is

Alaṅkāra, the sounds dominate it. When the sense is emphasised it is the Arthacitra and when we find equal emphasis for both the figures, sound and sense, it is considered as Ubhayacitra.

Śabdacitra and Arthacitra types are the same as the figures of sound and sense respectively where as the Ubhayacitra has both the characteristics. As a consequence of it they evoke admiration through representation. In this Citrakāvya it is evident from the very nomenclature that the writer's chief intention does not lie in the depiction of sentiment and as such it loses its competency to bring the emotional mood into existence. Strictly speaking as this type of poetry serves the purpose of giving relief to the reader from the seriousness of content it has been employed by great poets like Bhāravi.[63] Vidyānātha's' illustration for the Śabdacitra is as follows :

'Kṣoṇīrakṣaṇadakṣiṇāḥ kṣatajagatkṣobhāddurīkṣyakramāḥ

kṣudrakṣatriyapakṣaśikṣaṇavidhau praukṣipta kaukṣeyakāḥ /

uddāmodyamanasya rudranṛpaterdordaṇḍayoścaṇḍayor
garjaddurjana garvaparvatabhidā dambholayaḥ kelayaḥ'. [64] II

In this verse, though the figure Rūpaka is present, the figure Vṛttyanuprāsa, predominates. Hence the above verse illustrates Śabdacitra only.

For Arthacitra we have a Prākṛt verse of Vidyānātha, "Khagge jujjha vijjimbhiye" etc.,[65] which describes that the moment Pratāparudra holds the sword the enemy king has been frightened and resorted to Pratāparudra's mercy. The folded hands of the enemy king reflected on the sides of the sward and it looks as if the lotus, the abode of the goddess of Victory. Here the poet negates the lotus as belonging to the goddess of victory and presents it as the seat of the creator who came to collect the lives of the expired soldiers. Hence the figure here is Apahnuti.

The verse "Vidyāsamudre" etc.[66], is given as an example of Ubhayacitra. Here it is evident that the poet is equally enthusiastic both in Upama and Anuprasa and thus it can be considered as a model of Ubhayacitra, i.e., having figures based upon both sound and sense. Here, Kumārasvāmin states that although this variety is not mentioned by the earlier writers it is not against their intentions as they have accepted saṃsṛṣṭi in the examples such as -

'Padāmbujam bhavatu vo vijayāya mañju mañjīra siṃjita

manoharamambikāyāḥ ' [67]

Here Upama and Anuprasa do exist without any interdependence. While illustrating Śabdactitra and Ubhayacitra the two verses composed by Vidyānātha appear to depict the two sentiments Vīra and Śṛṅgāra. If that were to be the case, to show them as illustrations for Citrakāvya is not proper. For, they have to be reckoned as the illustrations of first type of Poetry. This objection, however, is answered by Kumārasvāmin in his commentary. He observes that though there is the suggestion of the above said two sentiments, the intention of the poet mainly lies in focusing the attention of the reader on figures only. According to the convention -

'Pradhānyato vyapadeśā bhavanti'

it is proper to accept here only figures and not sentiments. To support his view, he also quotes from Kāvyaprakāśa. In this connection Vidyānātha, following the earlier authors, speaks of pictorial poetry. As specimens he illustrates three varieties viz., Padmabandha, Cakrabandha and Nāgabandha. Hemacandra in his Kāvyānuśāsana defines that it is called Citra because of its similarity to the picture or by quality of creating surprise.[68] Prakāśavarṣa defines it as follows :

'Citram tu niyamanyāso varṇānā mīpsitakramam

Svaravarṇagatisthāna bandhahārādi bandhanāt [69] II

A fourfold division of this Citrakavita could be seen in Lakṣaṇadīpikā, viz., Āśu, Madhura, Citra and Vistraro. [70]

Now Vidyānātha dilates upon the varieties of Dhvanikāvya. It is already mentioned that poetry is of three kinds, Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama. These have been briefly illustrated also. Vidyānātha explains the intricacies of these types :

If the suggestion has secondary function as its basis it is considered as Avivakṣitavācya. If it takes the primary function as its basis it is called as Vivakṣitānyaparavācya. Avivakṣitavācyadhvani is again of two kinds - Arthāntarasaṅkramita and Atyantatiraskṛta. These again as based on word and sentence become four.

Vivakṣitānyaparavācya is of two types, viz., *Saṁlakṣyakramavyaṅgya* and *Asaṁlakṣyakramavyaṅgya*. *Saṁlakṣyakramavyaṅgya* is again of three kinds as based on sound, sense and both. *Arthaśaktimūladhvani* has twelve varieties as mentioned by Abhinavagupta.

Under Asaṁlakṣyakramadhvani come all the varieties of sentiments and transient moods.

'Rasabhāva tadābhāsa bhāvaśāntyādirakramaḥ' [71]

All these are reckoned as pure varieties which come to fifty one. Taking into consideration the possible combinations among these fifty one varieties the number grows to one thousand three hundred and twenty six. Again on the bases of the three varieties of Sankara and Saṁsṛṣṭi the one thousand three hundred and twenty six varieties multiply into five thousand three hundred and four. This is how Vidyānātha works out the possible varieties of Dhvani. It is to be noted here that Vidyānātha drastically cuts the number of Dhvani varieties from Mammaṭa which are enumerated as ten thousand four hundred

and four or ten thousand four hundred and fiftyfive to five thousand three hundred and four.[72]

In this connection the remarks of Kumārasvāmin are note-worthy. While enumerating the varieties of Dhvani, Vidyānātha mentions them as five thousand three hundred and four, whereas Mammaṭa in his Kāvyaprakāśa speaks of ten thousand four hundred and four varieties. What the difference is due to? Enlightening on this point, Kumārasvāmin observes that the issue does not deserve one's scruitiny as there is no plausible logic in such enumeration. He advises scholars to think for themselves. As regarding Vidyānātha, reason and logic plays a more important role than the respect we owe for a particular individual. Hence it appears, it is the view of Somapīthin that there is no logical basis in the enumeration of Mammata, while Vidyānātha strictly adheres to it.

". . . Śaraḥ pañca (5304). Tarhi kim nimittaṁ Kāvyaprakāśakarontarbhāvayātayāmānapi katicana bhedān saṁgṛhya caturuttaracatuḥśatīyutāyuta (10404) saṁkhyākān saṁsṛṣṭisaṁkarāyattabhedanajīgaṇat. Ko veda kiṁ vā nimittaṁ tat punasta eva tatrabhavanto vidāmkurvantu. Asmābhistu "Yuktiyuktam vaco grāhyaṁ na tu pūruṣagauravāt' iti nyayasaraṇiranusaraṇīyeti vidyānāthahṛdayam" [73]

While saying that Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya which comes under the second type of poetry, Vidyānātha quotes the Kārikā of Mamata [74] and follows his scheme in enumerating the eight types of it. He illustrates them with his own verses.

Though Vidyānātha mentions three types of poetry here, he elaborates third one in his last three consecutive chapters. Speaking on the characteristics of Mahākāvyas, Upakāvyas etc., in accordance with Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa,[75] Vidyānātha says that a Mahākāvya should have eighteen characteristics, viz., description of towns, oceans, mountains, seasons, the moon rise and the sun rise, pleasure gardens,

bathing sports, drinking of wine and the pleasures of dalliance; separation of sweet hearts, marriage, the birth of a son, strategy, gambling, travels and wars and the ascendency of the hero. The above eighteen is in strict accordance with Daṇḍin except in one case. While Daṇḍin stipulates embassy (Duta), as one of the eighteen, Vidyānātha alters it for gambling (Dyuta). However, he observes that a poet need not describe all the eighteen and some may not find place in a particular Poetry.

Hemacandravāgīśa explains that a Mahākāvya should contain cantos which suggest the parts of the theme and their divisions and these should not be too elaborate. He states that the cantos should neither be less than eight nor more than thirty[76] and these cantos should not contain either less than 30 verses or more than two hundred each[77]. The verses should lend pleasant hearing and the words chosen should be popular as far as possible. Only one metre should be employed throughout the section and a different metre should be used in the end[78]. But one finds Māgha violating this rule in the fourth canto of Śiśupālavadha. Viśvanātha adds that there should be suggestion of the future story at the end of the each canto. [79]

Vidyānātha divides Poetry broadly into three categories, Prose, Verse and a mixture of both. Poetry in verse without the division of cantos is designated as Upakāvya by Vidyānātha,[80] and Sūryaśataka is said to be an example for this category. While defining Campū as -

'Gadyapadyobhamayaṁ kāvyaṁ campūrityabhidhīyate' [81]

Vidyānātha draws again from Daṇḍin.

Vidyānātha appears to distinguish prose literature under two heads, Kathā and Ākhyayikā. He, however, does not mention anything about Kathā. Regarding Ākhyāyikā, following Abhinavagupta, he observes that a piece of prose is to be designated

as Ākhyāyikā where there are metres Vaktra and Aparavaktra and the chapters are known by the term Ucchvāsas.[82] As he has not mentioned anything about Kathā one can presume that the prose literature that does not having the above said characteristics comes to be designated as Kathā. In this connection it is to be noted that while Daṇḍin belittles the difference between Kathā and Ākhyayikā,[83] Vidyānātha maintains the distinction. Earlier writers, however, gave other varieties like Sakalakathā, Parikathā and Khaṇḍakathā with minor diferences which Vidyānātha seems to ignore.

While speaking of Kṣudraprabandhas, Vidyānātha speaks of five varieties, of which Udāharaṇa is one of them. It consists of both prose and verse and set to Tala. It contains the meters like Mālini and has the word "Jaya" in the beginning having the repetition of the same consonant often. It should have eight cases employed. Udāharaṇa has a long antiquity as we have the mention of this type twice in Kālidāsa.[84] We have very few Udāharaṇa type of Kāvyas in Sanskrit. However, it is worthy, to note that a Udāharaṇa type of Kāvya by name "Basavodāharaṇa" is written by Palkuriki Somanātha who is a contemporary of Vidyānātha. This Udāharaṇa type is mentioned in Pratāparudrīya, Sāhityacintāmani and Lakṣaṇadīpikā whose authors evidently belong to Āndhradeśa. Out of the three Udāharaṇa Kāvyas in Sanskrit, Basavodāharaṇa, Śivodāharaṇa, and Chikkadevarāyodāharaṇa, the authors of the first two are Telugu Poets.

Cakravāla is again another variety of Kṣudraprabandha where in one most often finds vocative cases. It starts with verses. The words that are employed once are taken up again. However, Amṛtānandayogin's definition of this type differs.[85]

Bhogāvali is another type of minor poems described by Vidyānātha. There we first find the mention of the word 'Deva'. The sections are named as Skandhas. This is furnished with four or eight sentences.

Here the style of the sentences is so properly managed as to deserve the descriptions of Gods and Kings.

The one which is full of the description of the titles of the hero and his name and which runs in bombastic style is called Birudavali. If the eulogy is of twenty seven verses it is considered as Tārāvalī.

Vidyānātha says that there may be many other types depending on the ingenuity of the poet. He states that the illustrations are left out for fear of the work growing bulky. Thus Vidyānātha covers a wide range of topics relating to poetry in a succinct manner and proceeds to dilate upon the dramatic technique.

CHAPTER - III

NĀṬAKA PRAKARANA

Vidyānātha then takes up the treatment of Drama, as it forms the best type of Kāvya.

As the Daśarūpaka of Dhanañjaya enjoys the status of being the foremost standard text next to Bharata's Nātyaśāstra, he heavily draws upon it in this chapter. He expressly states this at the end: "Eṣā prakriyā Daśarūpakoktirītyanusāreṇa". [1] He composes an Udāharaṇa nāṭaka where we find illustrations for all the concepts that he has dealt with in this chapter.

The dramatic representation is four fold viz., Sāttvika (Emotional), Āngika (Physical), Āhāryaka (Decorative) and the Vācika (Verbal). Sattva is a particular type of mental mood which is influenced by the contemplation of happiness or sorrow belonging to others. Such a mood brings about the efforts called Sāttvikābhāvas. The presentation of such ensuents is designated as Sāttvikābhinaya. The movements of the limbs in accordance with the sentiment depicted is known as physical representation or Āṅgikābhinaya. The element such as stage decor and scenic effects, constume and makeup of characters come under Decorative representation or Āhāryaka. The fourth one is the Vācikābhinaya or Verbal representation i.e., the dialogue delivery which includes the proper modulation, intonation, pronounciation and pause by which the identical feelings of the character are to be evoked in the spectators.

Vidyānātha further defines the word Nṛtya as one which depicts Bhāvas. Nṛtta is dancing to Tāla (rhythm), Laya (time). One may ask: what is the relevance of defining Nṛtya and Nṛtta in this context? Vidyānātha rightly answers the question saying that Nṛtya and Nṛtta can be introduced in a drama to a great advantage. He quotes the following verse of Daśarūpa in support of his statement which also

gives their two subdivisions namely Lāsya and Tāṇḍava.

'Madhuroddhatabhedena taddvayaṁ dvividham punaḥ I

Lāsyatāṇḍavarūpena nāṭakādyupakārakam II " [2]

The different types of Rūpakas are varieties of Nāṭya. They differ from one another on the basis of the three factors - plot, hero and sentiment. The nature of plot is discussed here by Vidyānātha. Different types of heroes and their definitions are given already in an earlier chapter. Rasa is the main subject matter of the next chapter.

1. THE ITIVṚTTA (PLOT) :

The vastu or the plot is considered as the body of the play. It has got another name as Itivṛtta. Bharata gives it utmost importance when he says-

'Itivṛttam hi kāvyasya śarīram parikīrtitam' [3]

This is further testified by the statement of Śāradātanaya which rurns as -

'Vastutatsyat prabandhasya śarīram kavikalpitam I

Itivṛttam tadevāhurnāṭyābhinaya kovidaḥ' [4]

The plot is divided differently on different criteria. The three-fold division of the plot viz., Prakhyāta (well-known), Utpādya (devised) and Miśra (mixed) is taken into consideration in the enumeration of the ten varieties of drama. A well-known theme means that which is already there in the Itihasas. In other words a theme that depends on historical facts is known as ' Prakhyātetivṛtta '. The devised theme (Utpādya) is a creation based on the poet's fancy and the mixed is an admixture of both the above elements. While most of the Ālaṅkārikas accept the three-fold division of the plot, Sāgaranandin,however, classifies the theme into two categories, viz., Upātta (taken) and

Pratisamskṛta (refined) taken up and adapted.[5]

The plot may further be divided into two categories viz.,Ādhikārika and Prāsaṅgika. Adhikārin is one who is the recipient of the fruit and the part of the story managed by him is called Ādhikārika[6]. For instance, in Rāmāyaṇa the story related to Rāma and Sītā is Ādhikārika. It has another name "Mukhya" also. The second type Prāsaṅgika is subsidiary and is ancillary to the main theme. This is of two types known as Patākā and Prakarī. That which runs with the main theme a long distance is called Patākā and that which follows for a while is designated as Prakarī. Thus the second type of classification of the plot may be taken again as three fold, Ādhikārika, Patākā and Prakarī. These three varieties, however, become nine on the consideration of the first type of classification, i.e., whether the plot is well known, fabricated and mixed[7]. Vidyānātha, however, indirectly hints at these nine varieties though he does not expressly state. He deals with Patākā and Prakarī only while dealing with the Arthaprakṛtis and does not mention them as the varieties of the plot.

Following Dhanañjaya, Vidyānātha further classifies the plot under the two heads Sūcya and Asūcya[8]. There are five modes of expression for the Sūcya and enunciated in the Daśarūpaka. They are (1) Viskambha (2) Cūlika (3) Aṅkāsya (4) Praveśaka and (5) Aṅkāvatāra.

Sāgaranandin calls these five as Arthopakṣepakas when he says-

'Aṅkāvataroṅkamukham viṣkambha praveśakau I

Cūliketi ca pañcāsminnarthopakṣepakāḥ smṛtāḥ' II [9]

A detailed exposition of the Arthopakṣepakas follows:

1.Viṣkambha or Viṣkambhaka (Explanatory Scene)

Vidyānātha explains simply that Viṣkhambha is presented by mediocre characters to inform the audience briefly the items of the story

that are past and are going to hapen.[10] But it may be noted that another purpose of the interludes known as Viṣkambhas and Praveśakas is to cover the lengthy stretches of the story that are unwieldy for dramatic handling. It may be a soliloquy or a dialogue between the two characters. It is of two kinds, Śuddha (pure) and Saṅkīrṇa (mixed). In the former Sanskrit alone is employed, while in the latter both Sanskrit and Prākṛt find a place. Nāṭyadarpaṇa observes that even a female character has to speak in Sanskrit if she has an entrance in the Explanatory scene.[11] There prevails a difference of opinion regarding the place of Viṣkambha in a drama. Bhoja opines that it should be employed as soon as the Prastāvanā is over in the first act itself. Others opine that it may be employed any where between any two acts [12]. Some others observe that Viṣkambha should be employed only in Prakaraṇa and Nāṭaka type of drama. [13]

ii. Cūlikā (Intimation Scene) :

According to Vidyānātha Cūlikā (intimation scene) is indication of an idea by those who are behind the curtain[14]. Kumārasvāmin explains the word Antaryavanikā as an inner curtain *'Antaḥ pradhāna yavanikā antaryavanikā'*. The characters speak from there without entering the stage at all. The characters may be males or females and there is no restriction as regards to the employment of language. According to Śāradātanaya it has a place even in the middle of an act and it can be employed among the other modes of introduction (Arthopakṣepaka) unlike Viṣkambhaka and Praveśaka[15]. Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa and Kāvyenduprakāśa mention two-fold division of Cūlikā viz., Khaṇḍacūlikā and Akhaṇḍacūlikā[16]. The Khaṇḍacūlikā is so called because it consists of intimating two facts from within the curtain. This can be employed in the beginning or the middle of an act. Akhaṇḍacūlikā is one where the entrance and the exit of the characters are visualised by the audience. The employment of Akhaṇḍacūlikā is used at the end, but sometimes at the beginning of an act also. Though Śāradātanaya opines that it should be

employed through Sūta, Māgadha and Vandin, Sāgaranandin defends with illustrations that it could be presented even otherwise and as such it has no steadfast rule in this regard [17].

Siṅgabhūpāla in his Rasārṇavasudhākara classifies Cūlikā into two types [18], Cūlikā and Khaṇḍacūlikā. Accoridng to him, Cūlikā is to be employed by the characters in the background only. Khaṇḍacūlikā is the conversation of the character on the stage with the character behind the curtain. This should be placed before the commencement of an act.

iii. Aṅkāsya or Aṅkamukha (Anticipatory Scene) :

Aṅkāsya or Aṅkamukha is said to be a scene wherein the story of all acts is briefly given. It should be employed in the first act of a play[19]. Dhanañjaya, however, mentions that it should suggest the events of the following act at the end of a previous one [20]. However, Aṅkāsya in the definition of Viśvanātha has very little to distinguish it from Aṅkāvatāra[21]. Vidyānātha, following the view of Dhanañjaya says that the theme of the coming act is to be indicated by the characters at the end of the previous act, through Aṅkāsya.

iv. Praveśaka (Introductory Scene) :

Vidyānātha now defines Praveśaka, the introductory scene. When the past and future episodes of the play have been suggested through one or two base characters it is called Praveśaka[22]. According to Kumārasvāmin it may be done through low characters like Ceṭī. The number of these characters may be one, two or many. Sometimes a mediocre character may be there along with them. This should not be employed in the first act. These episodes should naturally pertain to a previous or successive act. Sāgaranandin defines the term etymologically saying that as it makes the charactors enter it is called Praveśaka[23]. Its function is almost the same as that of the Viskhambhaka but it is presented by inferior characters in a language which is not

polished (Udātta). It explains the matters omitted between two acts[24]. Accoridng to Bharata all characters should speak in Prakṛt language[25]. Śāradātanya and Sāgaranandin, however, opine that Sanskrit can also be employed by ascetics, Brahmins, Sages chamberlain and rakes in case they are introduced in the Praveśaka[26]. Bharata speaks of five purposes at length that are to be served by Praveśaka[27]. Sāgaranandin opines that a Praveśaka can serve the purpose of intimating long journeys and the happenings in course of those journeys [28]. In fact, it is an effective device to present succinctly the events ranging over a long span of time [29]. According to Nāṭyadarpaṇa, Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka are to be employed in four types of plays, viz., Nāṭaka, Prakarana, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī [30].

v. Aṅkāvatāra (continuation Scene) :

Aṅkāvatāra is the scene where the theme of the succeeding act is shown to be connected (ānuṣaṅgata) to that of the preceding act. The actor of the one being the same as that of the other there need not be an introduction for them [31]. Kumarasvamin quotes in this connection:

"Aṅkābhyantara bhāvitvamaṅkasyāṅkāvatārayoḥ |

Bhavedaṅka bahirbhāvo viṣkambhe ca preveśake ||

Ubhayam cūlikāyām tu yathāyogamitisthitiḥ"[32] |

Aṅkāvatāra also should suggest a particular Sūcyārtha. It is merely the introduction of the new act while closing the previous act. The following words of Bharata testify to this:

"Samāpyamana ekasminnaṁśe hyanyasya sucanam |

samasato hi nāṭyoktaiḥ so,'nkavatara isyate" ||

With the above five scenes the indication (Sūcya) should be done and the rest (Dṛśya) should be performed through acts on the stage.

Vidyānātha now takes up the issue of Aṅka (act). He explains that an act is one in which the characters enter the stage and follows the hero with the colour and costume, dialogue and action and show the story of the hero. This should have the suggestion of Bindu (drop). This has various contextual purposes and serve as an abode of the scenes of story and sentiments. Here Kumārasvāmin quotes Bhāvaprakāśa which gives a caution as regards the introduction of Vastu, Rasa, and Alaṅkāras in an act. Both the prncipal and subordinate Rasas should not be over done losing sight of the movement of the story. Nor should Rasa be allowed to get obscured by the narration of the story and ornate style. He further adds that in depicting Aṅka (Act) one has to follow the path laid down by earlier Ālaṅkārikas. War, distant travel, death, mutiny, bath, putting on clothes, toilet, meal, siege or torment and love-making should not be shown in the acts. The main character should not be shown as killed under any circumstances. But it can also be shown if in the course of the story he is coming back to life afterwards. The activity of the hero of one day with a single purpose is to be shown. The heroes should be there throughout on the stage. The minor characters, three or four like Vidūṣaka may also be there. The act concludes with the exit of all the characters.

2. ĀMUKHA OR PRASTĀVANĀ (INDUCTION) :

According to the scheme of the Sanskrit drama the Sthāpaka Sūtradhāra enters after the exit of the first Sūtradhāra (Pūrvaraṅga vidhāyaka) and introduces the drama to the auidence. In course of this dialogue, the Sthāpaka adopts the Bhāratīvṛtti.

There are four sub-divisions of the Bhāratīvrtti which are supported to be present in Prastāvanā. They are (i) Prarocanā (Laudation), (ii) Vīthī (Avenue) (iii) Prahasana (Humour) and (iv) Āmukha (Insertion).

Out of these four sub-divisions, Vīthī [34] and Prahasana have developed as separate types of dramas and hence they are not

discussed here. As there is very little to be said about Prarocana, Vidyanatha aims it in the illustrative play [35]. The remaining one i.e. Āmukha is now dealt with in detail.

Vidyānātha says that the conversation of Sūtradhāra [36] with either Naṭī or Māriṣa or Vidūṣaka about his plans to stage a particular piece of drama is called Āmukha. It has got another name Prastāvanā [37]. Here the note of Kumārasvāmin is useful to enlighten us about the intricacies with regards to Sūtradhāra, Naṭī, Mārisa and Vidūṣaka. He says that there are two Sūtradhāras. To quote Kumārasvāmin -

'Dvāvatra sūtradhārau. Ekaḥ pūrvaraṅgavidhāyakaḥ.

Itarastu naṭasthāpakādyaparaparyāyaḥ pūrvasūtradhāra

sadṛśaguṇākṛtiḥ prastāvanāpravartakaḥ' [38]

The first one recites the benediction and exits. Then enters the second Sūtradhāra. He has two other names as Sthāpaka and Naṭa. His wife is known as Naṭī. His assistant is called Marisa and his confident minister Vidūṣaka. The Āmukha has three ancillaries as Kathodghāta, Pravartaka and Prayogātiśaya [39].

i. Kathodghāta (The Real Commencement) is the entrance of the character taking either a statement or its sense presented by Sūtradhāra.

ii. Pravartaka (Entrance of characters) is the entrance character indicated describing the characteristics of the season already referred to.

iii. Prayogātiśaya (Personal Presentation) is that type of entrance in which Sūtradhāra directly points out to the character with the pronominal words like 'Eṣa' and 'Ayam'

While explaining Āmukha, Vidyānātha enumerates its thirteen ancillaries Udghātyaka etc. The same ancillaries occur even in the case of Vīthī. Hence, Vidyānātha speaks of the ancillaries in this

context. Kumārasvāmin supports Vidyānātha in this connection by observing that the ancillaries for both Vīthī and Āmukha being the same, there is nothing wrong in dealing with them when Āmukha is taken up for explanation. It should not lead us to the assumption that both Vīthī and Āmukha are the same. Apart from ancillaries there are other factors which make Vīthī different from Āmukha.

For instance, in Vīthī the ancillaries like Kathodghāta are absent. Next, Sūtradhāra does not appear in Vīthī. Moreover, there is the need for all ancillaries like Udghātyaka and also partial importance. In Āmukha, however, there is difference in all the aspects and hence both cannot be the same. Vidyanatha explains the ancillaries briefly as follows:[40]

1. Udghātyaka (Abrupt dialogue) is of two kinds as Gūḍhārtha paryāyamalā and Praśnottaramālā.

2. Avalagita (Continuance) is also of two types:

(i) where the contextual purpose has been served by the mention of a non-contextual purpose;

(ii) achieving a non-contextual purpose under the pretext of achieving an altogether different purpose.

3. Prapañca (compliment) is mutual praise based on false hood. Somapīthin mentions an earlier view according to which the praise should also provoke one's laughter.

4. Trigata (Triple rendering) is again of two kinds. One is the ancillary of Pūrvaranga and the other is the ancillary of Prastāvanā. In the former we have conversation among the actors and others, while in the latter many ideas are simulataneously presented due to verbal oneness (Śabdasāmya).

5. Chala (Deception) is to deceive others through unpleasant

statements that resemble pleasant ones.

6. Vākkeli (Repartee) is defined differently by different authors. Vidyānātha speaks of Vākkeli having two varieties. The first is to abruptly stop a statement of incomplete sense. The second is of the form of questioning and answering. Viśvanātha adds that there should be the element of laughter also [41]. Dhanañjaya considers Vākkeli as a speech-play out of two or three replies or stopping the speech in the middle [42]. Siṅgabhūpāla considers this as completing the predication of a sentence of incomplete predication[43].

7. Adhibala (outvying) occurs where two actors try to excel each other in their conversation with the view of claiming supremacy.

8. Gaṇḍa (Abrupt Remark) is the unwitting speech that goes against the context.

9. Avasyandita (interpretation) is to give a different interpretation for the same statement made on account of one's liking - Kumārasvāmin adds that not only one's liking but dream, madness and childhood may also lead to such an interpretation.

10. Nālikā (Enigma) is an enigmatical expression involving fun. Kumārasvāmin considers this having two types as Internal (Antarlāpa) and External (Bahirlāpa).

11. Asatpralāpa (Incoherent talk) is prattling something which is irrelevant.

12. Vyāhara (Humurous talk) is a humurous statement that promotes laughter and greed.

13. Mṛdava (Euphemism) is speaking defects as virtues.

Out of these thirteen, some may be employed in Prastavana according to the need. Thus Vidyānātha deals with the details of the prelude in short.

NĀNDĪ (BENEDICTION)

Before the enactment of a play, the worship of a diety is prescribed in order to ward off obstacles. This is termed as Pūrvaraṅga. Accoridng to Bhāvaprakāśa it has twenty two ancillaries. But Vidyānātha does not either enumerate or define the ancillaries of Pūrvaraṅga. His commentator, Kumārasvāmin, however, observes that Pūrvaraṅga is a particular activity under taken in the beginning of a dramatic performance in order to avert obstacles. Bharata enumerates nineteen ancillaries of Pūrvaraṅga as Pratyāhāra, Avataraṇa, Ārambha, Āśravaṇa, Vaktrapāṇi, Parighaṭṭana, Saṅghoṭana, Mārgasārita, Asārita, Ciṭaka, Utthāpana, Parivartana, Nāndī, Śuskavekṛṣṭa, Raṅgadvāra, Cārī, Mahācārī, Trigata and Prarocana [44]. Dr. Surendranath Shastri divides the list into two groups with nine and ten ancillaries respectively. He observes that the ancillaries in the first group are pre-show arrangements and they are supposed to be performed behind the screen where as the ancillaries of the second group are to be performed on the stage after lifting the screen[45]. Śāradātanaya enumerates twenty two ancillaries of Pūrvaraṅga [46], which Kumārasvāmin seems to follow. Śāradātanaya adds Dhruvā, Trisama and Vardhamānaka to Bharata's list though there is a slight change in nomenclature as well as in the order. As Nāndī is considered to be the most important of all the ancillaries, Vidyānātha discusses it. Nāndī indicates the subject matter which is going to be enacted either by way of similarity of sound or sense. It may contain either eight, twelve, eighteen or twenty two words[47]. The first verse of a drama which has the above characteristics is called Nāndī. We have Nāndī consisting of eight words in Veṇīsaṃhāra, twelve words in Anargharāghava, and twenty two words in Bālarāmāyaṇa. Some aesthetes maintain that there is no need for restriction of words in Nāndī [48].

The etymological sense of the word Nāndī is given as something in which the dieties take delight [49].

Nāndī comprises of one or more verses. The mention of the Moon is considered as a special merit in a Nāndī verse, because it is the belief of our ancients that there is a good deal of influence of the Moon over sentiments. Similarly the mention of auspicious names such as couch, lotus, ruddy-goose, Lily are recommended by Viśvanātha [50]. According to Bharata, Nāndī should consist of eight or twelve feet [51]. But later eight, ten, twelve, eighteen or twenty two feet. Śāradātanaya, however, feels that Nāndī may have as many sentences as it requires for the expression of benediction. He also mentions the view of some who accept Nāndī of even four feet [52]. Siṅgabhūpāla observes that it may be of eight, ten, twelve feet [53]. Thus from a number of authorities it is evident that the eight footed Nāndī is much in vogue, though there are cases of Nāndī verses containing more feet.

Soon after Nāndī, in the Āmukha portion the stage-manager indicates the theme of the play while describing one of the six seasons. Here the composition Bhāratī is employed. Substantiating his statement, Vidyānātha quotes a verse from Daśarūpaka *'Raṅgaḥ prasādamadhuraiaḥ'*.etc. [54] As to the description of seasons we may note that it is only optional but not compulsory. The season should be indicative of the time of the story. In the dramas where love is chosen as the main sentiment, generally seasons like Spring are described. In the dramas having Heroic as the main sentiment, seasons like Śarat (Autumn) are chosen as they are favourable for leading armies. Of course, there is another school of thought which advocates that the season belonging to the time of the first Act has to be described, irrespective of the main sentiment of the drama.

In view of the systematic representation of the drama, the entire dramatic action is divided into five stages known as Ārambha (Commencement), Yatna (Endeavour), Prāptyāśā (Prospect of success), Niyatāpti (Certainty of success and Phalagama (Consummation or attainment of fruit). These five are technically called Pañcāvasthas.

i. ĀRAMBHA (COMMENCEMENT) :

Vidyānātha says that Ārambha is an earnest desire of the hero to achieve a noble fruit, in a great measure [55]. Kumārasvāmin explains that this fruit is of the form of the traid of values Dharma, Artha and Kāma. So this is the first stage of dramatic action because it is from the desire of the hero that all action proceeds.

ii. YATNA (ENDEAVOUR) :

Yatna is the intensified activity of the hero in order to achieve some end [56]. Kumārasvāmin speaks of another reading "Phalaprāptau" for "Phalāprāptau" According to the latter Prayatna can be defined as the intensified activity of the hero on account of the fruit being not attained. Daśarūpaka, however, takes the reading "Phalāprāptau" which Vidyānātha accepts. This marks the second stage of action. It also includes the strategy played and anxiety shown by the hero, that propels the hero in achieving his goal.

iii. PRĀPTYĀŚĀ (PROSPECT OF SUCCESS) :

Prāptyāśā is a state of dilemma of the hero regarding the achievement of the fruit on account of both means and suspicion and antimeans (Apāya) [57]. This is the third stage of action.

iv. NIYATĀPTI (CERTAINTY OF SUCCESS) :

Niyatāpti is the point where the hero is confident of achieving the fruit on account of the absence of anti-means (Apāya)[58]. This forms the penultimate stage of action.

v. PHALĀGAMA (CONSUMMATION) :

This is the stage where the dramatic action reaches its apex for fulfilment. This is the final stage where the complete attainment of the fruit is said to have been achieved. This is otherwise known as donouement [59].

Having thus explained the five stages of the hero or Pañcāvasthas, Vidyānātha discusses the five elements of the dramatic plot known as Arthaprakṛtis. The five Arthaprakṛtis are the Bīja (Seed), the Bindu (Drop), the Patāka (Episode) the Prakarī (Incident) and the Kārya (Denouement).

Vidyānātha defines Bīja as a cause of the fruit briefly mentioned and which develops in many ways later [60]. This again, according to Somapīthin, is of three types depending upon the type of Nāyaka chosen in the play. It is a well-known fact that Nāyakas can be classified under three heads.

1. Svāyattasiddhi, i.e., one who can achieve the fruit by himself.

2. Sacivāyattasiddhi, i.e. one who depends upon his minister for the attainment of the fruit.

3. Ubhayādhīnasiddhi is one who partly .depends upon the minister, himself playing an active role.

Based on these distinctions of Kumārasvāmin says that Bīja can be viewed as of three types [61].

Bindu literally means a drop. Accoridng to Vidyānātha Bindu is the cause which connects together the inclidents of a plot when there is a break due to intermediary factors [62].

Vidyānātha explains an episode as one that runs along with the main plot far extending. Thus it is an ancillary to the main plot [63]. Here Kumārasvāmin brings in a doubt and answers it himself. The point here is, authors like Śāradātanaya speak of a seperate fruit, not connected with the main one in the episode of Patāka. Somapīthin does not endorse this view. He observes that even the fruit of the ancillary is not independent but it helps the achievement of the final fruit. In this connection he takes the support of the Vedic injunction-

'Dadhnā indriyakāmasya juhuyāt'.

Here the ancillaries Dadhi etc., are connected with the main fruit. This is something like the servant who is well satisfied with the award of is master works incessantly for the achievement of master's task. Hence,it has to be accepted that the fruit of the ancillaries too indirectly helps the achievement of the main fruit [64]. According to Sāgaranandin Patāka which means a banner serves the purpose of high lighting the main plot just like the banner in a war field, though it rests in a particular place, embellishes the whole army [65].

Prakarī too is an episode which does not extend far, but capable of embellishing the main episode as Patāka does. It literally means a bunch of flowers.

Kārya is the fifth element of the dramatic plot, which manages the attainment of the final fruit. it depicts the cause or the MOTIF of the play.

The combination of the five stages of action with the five elements of the dramatic plot respectively results in the formation of the five junctures.

THE FIVE JUNCTURES:

Sandhi or juncture, as defined by Vidyānātha, is the relation of the episodes that have a specific purpose with the intermediary fruits.

'Sandhiranāmaikena prayojanānvitāni Kathānāmavāntara prayojana sambandhaḥ' [66]

Such being the case, it marks the component divisions of the dramatic action. Dilating upon the definition of Vidyānātha Kumārasvāmin observes that the fruit in a play may be one of the human ends, viz., Dharma Artha and Kāma. Sometimes Dharma is the main fruit and Artha and Kama subserve it. Again in another play Artha or Kāma a may be prominent having the other two subservient. It may also happen that the main fruit may have only one of the triad

as the ancillary. It may also be the case that the main fruit may not have any ancillary. Thus the prayojana or main fruit comes to have twelve varieties.

'Prayojanamātra trivargarūpam phalam. Tacca Dharmārtha kāmeṣvekaikasya svavyatiriktābhyām Dvābhyāmupasarjanābhyām vyāsena samāsenaca sambandhe kaivalye ca davādaśa vidham' [67]

Vidyānātha advocates that the corresponding catenation of the different stages of action and emotional stages of the hero (Avasthas) with the elements of the plot (Artha prakṛtis) results in the formation of the five junctures:

'Artha prakṛtayaḥ pañca Pañcāvasthāsamanvitaḥ I

yathā sankhyena jāyante mukhādyāḥ pañcasandhayaḥ II [68]

Thus, the combination of Ārambha with Bīja constitutes Mukhasandhi or Protasis. The coalition of Prayatna and Bindu result in Pratimukhasandhi or the Expansion of the dramatic action. Similarly the coaslscence of Praptyāśā and Patāka makes Garbhasandhi or Catastasis. In the same way, the catenation of Niyatapti with Prakari forms Avamarsandhi or Epitasis; and the conjunction of phalāgama and Kārya becomes Nirvahaṇasandhi or the Denouement.

I. MUKHASANDHI (PROTASIS) :

Vidyānātha says that Mukhasandhi is one by which the seed sprouts and forms the cause of various purposes and several sentiments. On account of the coalition of Bīja and Ārambha the ancillaries or Aṅgas in Mukhasandhi are twelve in number [69]. By the word "Aṅga" we means an Avayava in the form of Kathāmśa which is useful for Sandhi.

The twelve Aṅgas are: Upakśepa, Parikara, Parinyāsa, Vilobhana, Yukti, Prāpti, Samādhana, Vidhāna, Paribhāvana, Udbheda, Bheda

and Karaṇa. Out of these twelve, Vidyānātha says that the following six, viz., Upakṣepa, Parikara, Parinyāsa, Yukti, Udbheda and Samādhāna should be employed in a drama. The remaining six may be employed according to the context using the discretion of the writer.

1. Upakṣepa (Suggestion): The installation of the seed (Bījanyāsa) is called Upakṣepa or suggestion [70]. It introduces the hero's desire which forms the very nucleus of the dramatic action.

2. Parikara (Enlargement) : The extension or expansion of the above seed is called Parikara.

3. Parinyāsa (Establishment) : Parinyāsa is the germination of the seed.

4. Vilobhana (Allurement): Vilobhana is the description of the qualities of the seed.

5. Yukti (Resolve) : Yukti is a discussion of the fruit of particular incident conducive to the seed.

6. Prāpti (Attainment) : Prāpti is the acquisition of happiness related to the seed.

7. Samādhāna (Settling) : Samādhāna is the presence of the seed.

8. Vidhāna (Conflicting of feelings): Vidhāna is the cause for happiness or sorrow related to the seed.

9. Paribhāvana (Surprise): Paribhāvana is the mental upsurge of feelings related to the seed.

10. Udbheda (Disclosure): Udbheda is to exhibit the seed which has been concealed.

11. Bheda (Division): Bheda is the encourc ement conducive to the seed.

12. Karaṇa (Resumption): Karaṇa is the beginning of a contextual action related to the seed.

All the canonists are of the same opinion with regards to the twelve ancillaries of the Mukhasandhi though there is a slight variation in the nomenclature as well as in the order [71]. For example, the eleventh ancillary is considered as Karaṇa and the twelfth as Bheda by Bharata, Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya, Sāgaranandin and Viśvanātha, where as the reverse order is maintained (i.e., Bheda and Karaṇa) by Vidyānātha which is followed by his successors like Siṅgabhūpāla and Abhinavakālidāsa.

II. PRATIMUKHA SANDHI (METABASIS) :

The manifestation of the seed which is both visible and invisible is designated as Pratimukha Sandhi. It has thirteen ancillaries which are to be employed in accordance with its two constituents, Bindu and Prayatana [72]. The definition given in Nāṭyadarpaṇa, however, shows a deviation. It does not speak of Bīja being Laksya and Alakṣya. According to it the expression related to Bīja and which is partly seen, itself consitutes the juncture Pratimukha [73].

Vidyānātha lists out the thirteen sub-divisions of the Pratimukha Sandhi and defines their characteristics as follows:

1. Vilāsa (Craving): is the desire for dalliance.

2. Parisarpa (Pursuit): is an act following a thing which was first seen and then disappeared.

3. Vidhūta (Disinterest) : is to discard the undesirable element.

4. Sama (Pacification) : is the subsidence of tastelessness.

5. Narma (Joke): is a statement made for fun.

6. Narmadyuti (Amusement) : is the pleasure that arises on

account of the expression of affection and love.

7. Pragamana (Responses): is to bring to light the seed of affection through consecutive statements.

8. Nirodha (Impediment): is averting the advent of a pleasant thing under some pretext.

9. Paryupāsana (Apology): is consolation of one's kith and kin.

10. Vajra (Bolt): is the statement that expresses harsh and unpalatable ideas.

11. Puspa (Gallantry): is an expression of love and affection.

12. Upanyāsa (Intimation or Propitiation) : is the composition of utterances that generate affection.

13. Varṇasamhāra (Congregation): is a thorough description of the four castes.

Out of the above thirteen, Parisarpa, Pragamana, Vajra, Upanyāsa, and Puṣpa are considered as important by Vidyānātha. The ancillaries of Pratimukha sandhi are considered as thirteen in number by all the canonists.

III. GARBHASANDHI (CATASTASIS)

Coming to Garbhasandhi, Vidyānātha explains it as a frequent search for seed which was once seen and lost. Its ancillaries are so formed as to be conducive to Prāptyāśā and Patāka. He, however, fails to mention whether Patāka in Garbhasandhi is an indispensable feature. Somapīthin, however, observes that there are two views one advocating the presence of it and the other speaking of option. Even in the second case, though Patāka is not present, Prāptyāśā, one of the five avasthas is essential.

'Atra patākāyāḥ vaikalpikatvāt tadabhavapakṣepi Prāptyāśā nityaiva' [74].

There are twelve ancillaries for this juncture and they should be employed in accordance with Prāptyāśā and Patāka.

1. Abhutāharaṇa (Mis-statement): is a deceitful act which helps a present purpose.

2. Mārga (Indication) : is a statement of fact.

3. Rūpa (Reflection) : is a statement that presents a dilemma.

4. Udāhṛti (Exaggeration): is the speech that brings forth the greatness of what is contextual.

5. Krama (Progress): is the attainment of the desired object.

6. Sangraha (Propitiation): is a statement proposing Śama and Dama that are useful to the context.

7. Anumāna (Inference): is the inference of particular thing depending on an indicator.

8. Toṭaka (Quarrel): is the speech born out of confusion and anger.

9. Adhibala (Outwitting): is the deception of one's kith and kin.

10. Udvega (Dismay): is the fear from those who are harmful.

11. Sambhrama (Terror): is both doubt and fear.

12. Ākṣepa (Revelation): is to follow some means in order to achieve one's desired object.

Out of these, the five viz., Abhutāharaṇa, Mārga, Toṭaka, Adhibala and Ākṣepa are important factors.

Although almost all the canonists are of the same view with regards to the number of ancillaries of Garbhasandhi, we find that these are enumerated as thirteen in Nāṭyaśāstra, Nāṭyadarpaṇa and Śāhityadarpaṇa, the thirteenth being Vidrava. In Nāṭyadarpaṇa this Vidrava is placed in the eighth place where as Toṭaka is considered as the thirteenth.

IV. VIMARŚASANDHI (EPITASIS) :

This has got thirteen ancillaries, which are to be employed in accordance with Niyatāpti and Prakarī. In Vimarśasandhi, the seed which has been made well-known in Garbhasandhi is expatiated upon in view of some cause. It is also known as Avamarsasandhi. The ancillaries of this junctures are :

1. Apavāda (Censure) : is publicising one's mistakes.

2. Sampheṭa (Rebuke) : is the speech suggested by anger.

3. Vidrava (Tumuit) : is murder and imprisonment etc.

4. Drava (Contempt) : is the infringement of elders.

5. Śakti (Placating) : is the Passification of rivalry.

6. Dyuti (Excitement) : is agitation and threatening.

7. Prasanga (Reference) : is eulogizing elders.

8. Calana (Disrespect) : is comparison.

9. Vyavasāya (Boasting) : is boasting one's capacities.

10. Nirodha (Opposition) : is abusing one another out of anger

11. Prarocana (Precursion) : is the narration of something auspicious, which is going to happen.

12. Vicalana (Praise) : is exhibiting one's own virtues; and

13. Ādāna (Summary) : is taking up what ought to be done.

Out of the above thirteen, Apavāda, Śakti, Vyavasāya, Prarocana and Ādāna are essential elements. Here also Bharata, Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, and Abhinava Kālidāsa speak of fourteen ancillaries varying with each other in the nomenclature. According to Bharata Prarocana is the fourteenth while it is Bhāvāntara in view of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra and it is Niyatāpti in Abhinava Kālidasa's view.

V. NIRVAHAṆASANDHI (CONSUMMATION OR APODOSIS)

There are fourteen ancillaries which may be employed according to Phalāpti and Kārya. It is the juncture where the Mukha etc., connected with the seed and scattered are made to converge to yield a single fruit. The following are the ancillaries with their explanations

1. Sandhi (Junction) : is the culmination of the seed to yield the fruit.

2. Virodha (Vigilance) is the search for denouement.

3. Grathana (Hint) is to present a particular act that deseves to be done.

4. Nirṇaya (Narration) is to eulogize something which is conducive to the seed.

5. Paribhāṣa (Conversation) is mutual conversation.

6. Prasāda (Graciousness) is courtesy shown.

7. Ānanda (Bliss) : is the attainment of the desired object.

8. Samaya (Deliverence) is pacification of one's grief

9. Kṛti (Consolation) is the consolidation of the object attained.

10. Ābhāṣaṇa (Satisfaction) is complimenting on the achievement of the desired object.

11. Upagūhana (Surprise) is the attainment of the wonderful object.

12. Purvabhāva (Anticipation) is to witness the desired object.

13. Samhāra (Termination) is the conclusion of the attainment of fruit.

14. Praśasti (Benediction) is an expression of auspecious to happen. In this juncture, however, there is no difference of opinion among the canonists with regard to the number of ancillaries.

Thus the five junctures with their sixty four ancillaries have been explained by Vidyānātha in detail. As shown above the ancillaries are enumerated as sixty six in total in the Nāṭyaśāstra and the Nāṭyadarpaṇa and Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa. But it is to be noted that they too speak of sixty four ancillaries though their enumeration is otherwise. Vidyānātha gives six specific purposes for these sixty four ancillaries :

i. To put forth the desired idea (Vivakṣitārthapratipādana)

ii. to conceal what ought to be concealed (Gopyārthagopana);

iii. to bring to light what deserves to be publicised (Prakāśyārtha prakāśana);

iv. the abundance of action and music (Abhinayarāgasamṛddhi);

v. to create aesthetic pleasure (Camatkāritva); and

vi. to dilate upon the plot (Itivṛttavistāra)

Kumārasvāmin defends this by quoting Śṛṅgāraprakāśa which runs as "Aṅgānām ṣaḍvidhaṁhyetadḍṛṣṭam śāstre prayojanam" [75] The

employment of Sandhyangas are very essential for a drama. A drama devoid of these ancillaries cannot be a popular one. For, Viśvanātha emphatically says :

> *'Angahīno naro yadvannaivārambhakṣamo bhavet* I
>
> *Angahīnam tathākāvyam na prayogāya yujyate'II* [76]

These ancillaries should be employed according to the state of the sentiment. But one should not be over enthusiastic to employ all the elements with a view that they have all been prescribed, for, Ānandavardhana says :

> *'Sandhi-Sandhyanga-ghaṭanam rasābhivyaktyapekṣayā* I
>
> *Natu Kevalayā śāstrasthiti-sampādanecchayā'II* [77]

For this purpose it is said that the description of Erotic in the context of a war is to be avoided. Critics have found fault with the author of the Veṇisamhāra, for, there is the description of Erotic sentiment between Duryodhana and Bhānumati in the harem [78]. There is no order for the employment of the Upakṣepa etc., unless there is the relation of cause and effect. So, in essence these are to be employed at the descretion of the writer.

THE TEN TYPES OF PLAYS

1. NĀṬAKA :

Vidyānātha starts with Nāṭaka type. According to him it comprises of five junctures Mukha, Pratimukha etc. Erotic or Heroic should be the main sentiment and other sentiments are introduced as ancillaries. The Hero should be a well known one and a Dhirodatta. [79].

This is the brief definition of Nāṭaka given by Vidyānātha. This variety of Nāṭaka, however, on account of its having all the ancillaries in their entirety, is called the Prakṛti. All other types of Rūpaka come under Vikṛtis. Kumārasvāmin, however, adds that the author should be

alert in deleting such improprieties which are detrimental to the prestige of the hero or to the sentiment or he should change them in such a manner that they glorify the dignity of the hero [80]. Kālidasa's characterisation of Duṣyanta stands as an example for this. Bharata, Śāradātanaya, Viśvanātha and Siṅgabhūpāla observe that a Nāṭaka should depict the life of a distinguished prince of saintly character. (Prakhyāta rājarṣiḥ) [81]. In this connection we have a divergent view presented by a school of thought, represented by Viśvanātha and Siṅgabhūpāla holding that the hero should be only Dhīrodātta, but not others [82]. This proposition, however, seems to be untenable because it has neither the support of stalwarts in the field like Bharata nor the practice of the playwrights. For example, we find Dhīralalita type of heroes in plays like Svapnavāsavadatta, Ratnāvalī, Tāpasavatsarāja, Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa and the heroes belong to Dhīroddhata type in plays such as Veṇīsamhāra which are considered as belonging to Nāṭaka type by critics. Sāgaranandin's contention is also equally untenable, for, acording to him the hero should belong to Dhīralalita type only [83]. On the contrary we have Dhīrodātta type of heroes in plays like Uttararāmacarita, Malavikāgnimitra.

2. PRAKARAṆA :

Speaking on Prakarana, Vidyānātha says that it should contain a concocted plot and the hero should be a Dhīraśānta type, erotic being the main sentiment, and the rest of the ancillaries are like those of Nāṭaka [84]. Somapīthin obseve, that a hero in a Prakaraṇa should either be a minister, a brahmin, or a tradesman. The hero who is a Dhīraśānta has to be depicted as one very much interested in the triad Dharma, Artha and Kāma. The Prakaraṇa is of three types depending upon the type of heroine :

i. the play which has a concubine as the heroine,

ii. the play which has a family lady as the heroine, and

iii. the paly which has both of them as heroines [85].

Etymologically, the word Prakaraṇa is explained as "Prakarṣeṇa Kriyate vastu yasminniti prakaraṇam". The originality of the plot is considered to be the special feature of a Prakaraṇa which alone distinguishes it from the Nāṭaka group. As this type has more Praveśakas and acts with the Vikṛtirūpakas it has got the name Prakaraṇa. It has,however, certain peculiarities of its own [86]. There is no place for divine characters in a Prakaraṇa even for the slight assistance. But low characters like slaves and rakes, dancing girls and their paramours, gamblers and gamesters can be employed with advantage [87].

3. BHĀṆA :

The word Bhāṇa is derived from the root "Bhaṇa vaktāyām vāci". Bhāratīvṛtti has its prevalence in this type. The plot comprises the description of the behaviour of swindlers, gamblers etc. This consists of one act and two junctures Mukha and Nirvahaṇa. The theme, here is concocted. A dexterous Paramour is the speaker here and his peech is full of praises for valour and prosperity suggesting the erotic and heroic sentiments. As Bhāṇa is a monologue the actor pretends as if he hears some body speaking while there is none. This is technically called Ākaśabhāṣita [88]. Even the flok songs can have a place in this type. Mukundananda, Pañcabāṇavijaya, Padmaprābhṛtika (ascribed to Śūdraka) are the examples for this type of plays.

4. PRAHASANA :

In prahasana the main sentiment is humour. As regards for other details like ancillaries of junctures and Vṛttis it falls in a line with Bhāṇa. This is of three types, as Śuddha,. Vikṛta and Saṅkīrṇa. Śuddha Prahasana deals with the attire and speech of Buddhistic monks, which has orthodox Brahmins, heretics, servants and strumpets. In Vaikṛta Prahasana there is the imitation of speech and dress of paramours,

illicit lovers, old people, ennuchs, hermits and chamberlines in the harem which tickles the audience to laughter. The third type Saṅkīrṇa Prahasana is full of descriptions of the behaviour of swindlers and has the same ancillaries as of Vīthī and Udghātaka [89]. In Prahasana the theme is concocted and the people like atheists are heroes. It is a one-act play. As it tickles the audience to laughter it is called Prahasana. While Bharata, Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra and Sāgaranandin speak of two varieties only as Suddha and Saṅkīrṇa, Śāradātanaya, Dhanañjaya, Vidyānātha and Viśvanātha include Vaikṛta also making three varieties. Bhagavadajjuka of Bodhāyana is considered as the oldest and good Prahasana. Mattavilāsa, Laṭakamelaka, Lambodaraprahasanas are some which deserve mention belonging to later times. According to Daśarūpaka this farce may contain all the six varieties of the comic sentiment[90]. Siṅgabhūpāla gives the account of the ten elements of Prahasana [91]. The presence of Gentle Dance (Lāsya) is considered to be the most important characteristic of a Prahasana. However, it follows the pattern of Bhāṇa with regards to the other details.

5. ḌIMA :

The word "Ḍima" is from the root "Ḍima Saṅghāte" which means that it has the episodes of many heroes. In Ḍima the plot is a popular one. There may be sixteen heroes like Deities, Demons, Gandharvas, Devils, Yakṣas and other infernal beings (pretas), exciting (Dīpta) of vehement type. The sentiment should be other than humour and erotic, preferably furious. By the word 'exciting' the question of Quietic does not arise. There may be four acts with four junctures except Avamarśa juncture. Illusion, sorcery, war, the Lunar and the Solar eclipses and meteors find a place in this type. All Vṛttis can be employed in it except Kaiśikī. The rest should be like that of a Nāṭaka [92]. The famous examples for this type are said to be Tripuradāha and Vīrabhadra Vijṛmbhaṇa. The scenes like the Viṣkambhaka or the Praveśaka are absent in this type and the duration of the theme extends to a period

of four days spread over the four acts of the play[93].

6. VYĀYOGA :

In Vyāyoga the plot is a popular one and the hero is vehement. The sentiment should be preferably the heroic as in Ḍima which results in the presence of six sentiments excluding the Quietic, the erotic and the humourous. Here is the absence of the junctures Garbha and Avamarśa. All the Vṛttis except Kaiśikī may be employed. The story should be a military spectacle which had happend in a single day, for which the cause should not be a woman [94]. It should have only one act and as the assemblage of many men in this type it is named as Vyāyoga [95]The famous examples of Jamadagnyajaya, Kirātārjunīya and Narakāsuravyāyoga fall into this type.

7. SAMAVAKĀRA :

In Samavakāra the plot may be popular or a concocted one. The heroes are twelve belonging to gods and demons having seperate fruits. The heroic sentiment should be predominant. All junctures with the exception of Avamarśa should be present.

It is a dramatic representation in which there is the fusion of different types of characters with different motives [96]. Etymologically the word Samavakāra is explained as *'Saṅghātair avakīrṇaiśca arthaiḥ kriyate iti samavakāraḥ'* which means to contain several scattered items of action finally connected with each other, or it may be , as Kumārasvāmin says, *'Samantādavakīryante ' sminnartha iti samavakāraḥ'.* According to Bharata, Dhanañjaya and Śāradātanaya who categorically state that the heroes of Samavakāra should belong to gods and demons, there is no place for a mortal hero in this type [97]. However, Viśvanātha's choice is between Gods and men in this regard[98]. Though Vidyānātha observes that he follows Dhanañjaya while dealing with the chapter on drama he appears to hav different view from him regarding the type of heroes that occur

type of play. While Dhanañjaya is specific in his statement that only gods and demons appear as heroes Vidyānātha adds "ādi" and lends scope for other types of heroes also to enter the field. It may be his view that mortals need not be excluded. The view of Viśvanātha who specifically mentions mortals also lends support to such a supposition. With regards to the employment of twelve heroes, there are divergent views. While some canonists believe that all the twelve should take part in each act of the play, others make a division of their business and their entrances [99]. The whole play is divided into three acts. The junctures of Opening and Expansion may find place in the first act where Catastasis and Consummation takes their places in the second and the third acts respectively, the Catastrophe being totally absent.

Vidyānātha divides the whole theme of the drama into three sections. The first section which normally takes three yāmas should be shown in the first Act. The second section which takes one yāma should be shown in the second Act. The third one whose duration should be half yāma should be presented in the third Act. Thus, according to him the theme taken to be presented in a Samavakāra should have its duration 4 1/2 yāmas. Authors like Bharata, Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya, Rāmacandra and Gunacandra, Siṅgabhūpāla give the time in terms of Nālikas. All authors agree that the whole spectacle should be with in 18 Nālikas with the act wise division of 12+4+2. Here is an interesting point to note. According to them a Nālika means two ghaṭis. "Nālikā ghaṭikā dvayam" (D.R.III-62) Ghaṭi is equivalent to 24 minutes and as such as Nālika should mean 48 minutes according to them. But Monier Williams and Apte consider no difference between Nālika and Ghaṭī. According to them Nalikā means 24 minutes [100]. However, Bharata testifies this time factor. According to Vidyānātha 4 1/2 Yamas come to 13 1/4 hours. According to the earlier writers with the exception of Bharata if Nālikā were to be two ghaṭikas the story of the whole play should consist of 18 x 48 minutes which should come to 864 minutes of duration or 14 hours and 24 minutes or 7 hours and 12 minutes. This view of Monier

Williams agrees with that of Bharata. Śāradātanaya says that the Nālika is one fourth of the Muhūrta [101]. At that rate of Nālikā means 12 minutes as Muhūrta is considered to be of 48 minutes. So, we find Bharata, Dhanañjaya and Vidyānātha have different views in this connection. According to all the canonists it should contain three types of delusions, three types of fleeing away and three types of erotics. The first variety of delusion arises out of wild animals. The second is providential caused by fire, rain, wind etc. The third, however, is caused by enemies and is of the form of war etc. The second i.e., Vidrava also falls under three categories according to the type of 'Kapaṭa'. The third erotics, too, is of three types. The first one is based on pieteousness (Dharma), the second is the cause for attaining kingdom etc. The third one based on simple passion, is enjoyable as it arises from drinking liquors and contacts with other women. The example quoted for this type of a play is Samudramathana.

8. VĪTHĪ :

Vīthī is a one act play with fictuous plot, Dhīrodātta being the hero. The sentiment erotics is slightly indicated. It is presented in Kaiśikīvṛtti. The ancillaries Udghātyaka etc. are as in Bhāṇa. It has the junctures of Mukha and Nirvahaṇa. It has its own 13 ancillaries known as Vīthyaṅgas which could be adopted in the induction of a play. They could also be liberally adopted by the playwrights according to the need. As it is evident from the very title itself, Vīthī signifies an avenue open for all kinds of performances which could be used with advantage, in all junctures.

Malatīvīthī is an exmaple of this type. The heroine should be either Sāmānyā or Parakīyā.

9. AṄKA (UTSṚṢṬĀṄKA) :

According to Vidyānātha Aṅka should depict a well-known story. Bharata and Viśvanātha, however, permit even a fictitious one [102]. The

chief sentiment is pathetic and the hero is an illiterate and uncultured. Though it has profuse lamentations of the women and speeches of full of remorse and sorrow it should not have a tragic ending. Bhāratīvṛtti prevails in this type of the play. It is called Utsṛṣṭāṅka for the reason that it abides the general principles applicable to other types of dramas [103]. Śarmiṣṭāyayāti is an example for this type.

10. ĪHĀMṚGA :

Vidyānātha explains that the plot in Īhāmṛga is a mixed one and the hero is a vehement one and the sentiment is Śṛṅgārābhāsa. It consists of four acts and three junctures excluding Garbha and Avamarśa. In Īhāmṛga the hero should be a human being and the villian a divine one. The whole plot hinges round the attainment of a celestical nymph who is not to be easily attained. There is the combat on her account which does not result in death. Rukmiṇīpariṇaya is a piece belonging to this type. However, Sāgaranandin mentions of Kuṇḍaśekharavijaya as belonging to this type [104]. Kumārasvāmin, in this connection gives the etymology of the terms as *'Mṛgavadalabhyam nāyikām nāyako 'sminnīhata itīhāmṛgaḥ'* [105].

In this way Vidyānātha closes the theoretical part of the Drama and composes a drama by name "Pratāparudrakalyāṇa" as an illustration.

CHAPTER - IV

RASA PRAKARANA

The theory of Rasa, which has invited various interpretations by different scholars, has its basis in the Rasasūtra by Bharata. Though writers like Kohala and Nandikesvara have been mentioned in the Nāṭyaśāstra as the predecessors of Bharata, their theories in this connection are not available to us. Hence Bharata's Rasasūtra is the earliest available information regarding Rasa. The two keywords in the definition of Bharata, viz., 'Saṁyogāt' and 'Niṣpattiḥ' have given scope for different theories, almost antogonistic to each other. Bhaṭṭalollaṭa's 'Utpattivāda', Śriśaṅkuka's 'Anumitivāda', Bhaṭṭanāyaka's 'Bhuktivāda' and Abhinavagupta's 'Vyaktivāda' are considered to be the main theories and Abhinavagupta's theory is considered to be the coping stone in the edifice of Rasa. Though almost all the writers of the post Abhinavagupta period belong to his school, Vidyānātha, however, appears to differ from the view of Abhinavagupta in certain aspects, and this point will be taken up in this chapter at the relevant place.In the chapter on Sentiments, Vidyānātha defines Rasa as the Sthāyībhāva (Permanent emotive mood) itself nourished by the equipment of Vibhāva etc.

' Vibhāvānubhāva sāttvika vyabhicari sāmagri

samullasita sthāyībhāvo Rasaḥ' [1]

In support of his view, he quotes Dhanañjaya, the author of Daśarūpaka. Kumārasvāmi Somapīthin, while explaining the concept of Rasa, resorts to the ideas given in the Bhāvaprakāśa of Śāradātanaya. In Bhāvaprakāśa Rasa has been defined as -"Prakaśānanda cidrūpā"[2] and the mood responsible for the creation of such a Rasa is the permanent emotive mood. He sums up his discussion saying that the permanent emotive mood which is in the connoisseur as a latent impression, is brought

to the state of enjoyment. Then it is designated as Rasa.

'Sāmājikaniṣṭhaḥ ratyādi stāyibhāvaḥ rasyate āsvādyate iti Rasaḥ'[3]

In this connection Kumārasvāmin mentions the views of the prominent interpreters of Bharata's Rasasūtra. First he mentions the view of Bhaṭṭalollaṭa, which opines that the permanent emotive mood which originally exists in the heroes like Rāma, appears as existing in the actor who has been taken no way different from the hero. According to this view, Rasa originates in the actor. Śaṅkuka, however, observes that the connoisseurs infer Rasa in the actor with the help of the Vibhāva etc., which serves as Liṅga. This theory of inference, however, has been criticised by Bhaṭṭanāyaka who brings in three functions - Abhidhā, Bhāvanā and Bhogakṛttva to explain the process of Rasa realisation. The first one presents Vibhāva etc., the second one brings about universalisation and the third one enables the reader enjoy the sentiment. Thus his theory is known as 'Bhuktivāda'. Abhinavagupta, the famous interpreter of Rasasūtra finds fault even with Bhaṭṭanāyaka and opines that the latent impression Rati etc., which lie embedded in the spectator are brought to the realm of his experience. Hence, according to him, the awakened latent impression itself is Rasa. Explaining the term 'Sthāyī' in 'Sthāyībhāva', Vidyānātha observes that it is a kind of stability unaffected by heterogeneous and homogeneous feelings by virtue of which the spectator comes to enjoy it. He quotes here the Daśarūpaka to support his view. In this connection Kumārasvāmin presents two views regarding the relationship of Sthāyin and Rasa. According to the first, Sthāyin itself transforms into sentiments as the threads form into cloth :

'Tatra ādyaḥ paṭam prati tantuvat rasam prati ākāramātra vyavahitaḥ sthāyibhāvaḥ'[4]

Explaining the second view he observes :

"Kuvindādivat bhāvāntara vyavahitaḥ vibhāvādihtasya sthāyi dvārā rasollāsakatvam" [5]

According to this view the preceding state of Rasa which is akin to the Supreme Bliss is called Sthāyibhāva. The pleasure which we derive in a drama is the supreme bliss itself with the distinction, that while the former is conditioned, the latter is not so. This phenomenon has been illustrated by Kumārasvāmin as follows :The moon in the skies when reflected in the water appears to have fickleness. The same analogy holds good in the case of supreme bliss and the bliss derived while enjoying sentiments.

Following Abhinavagupta and others, Vidyānātha mentions the number of sentiments as nine. In this connection, Somapīthin quotes the views of Dhanika and Bhoja. According to Bhoja erotic is the only sentiment. Dhanika, however, feels Rasas are only eight excluding Śānta. There is a third school which adds Vātsalya to the already existing nine and makes the number ten. Vidyānātha, however, follows the view of Abhinavagupta and Mammaṭa in this respect.

Explaining the nature of Rasasāmagri, Vibhāva etc., Vidyānātha mentions Vibhāva as of two kinds - Ālambana vibhāva and Uddīpana vibhāva.The first, however, forms the most prominent cause of Rasa. His definition *'Rasa Samavāyikāraṇamālambana Vibhāvaḥ'* [6] needs much explanation. If we follow the Naiyāyika school and explain, the term Samavāyikāraṇa, then it goes to mean that Nāyaka is the Samavāyikāraṇa for the Rati in him. The convention of the Naiyāyikas is - *'Guṇaguṇinoḥ samavāyaḥ'*. [7]

This interpretation, however, goes against the traditional view which can be summed up in the following line : *'Evam yaścacittavṛttteryo viṣayaḥ sa tasya ālambanam'*. [8] According to this traditional view, for

the Rati residing in the Nāyaka, the Ālambana vibhāva is Nāyikā, but not Nāyaka himself. To avoid this controversy the term Samavāyikāraṇa is to be explained as Pradhānakāraṇa. This means that out of all the causes that go to make the sentiment, Ālambanavibhāva is the most prominent one without which the rest of the causes are of no avail. Kumārasvāmin has nothing to say in this context. He simply ignores the term and goes to the next item Anubhāva. Tirumalācārya, the author of the Ratnaśāṇa commentary adds a note on this point. He observes :

"Rasasya Śṛṅgārādeḥ Rasasamavāya sambandhavat kāraṇaṁ samavāyi kāraṇam śṛṅgārasthāyibhāvānāṁ ratyādīnāmicchādirūpatayā guṇatvam tadāśrayabhūtau nāyikānayakau guṇinau tayoḥ sambandhaḥ samavāya itibhāvah. Ata evālambanavibhāvo nāyikānayakaścetyuktam". [9]

According to the view of the Naiyāyikas, the relation between Guṇa and Guṇin is Samavāya. Rati is of the form of desire, hence a Guṇa. It rests in both Nāyaka and Nāyikā. Both are Ālambanavibhāvas. Hence Vidyānātha's statement that Ālambanavibhāva is the Samavāyikāraṇa of sentiments is appropriate.

Vidyānātha defines Anubhava as -

"Karyabhūto' nubhāvasyāt kaṭākṣādiśśarīrajah" [10]

Kumārasvāmin draws a subtle point here. He observes that Kārya has to be defined as - 'Prāgabhāvapratiyogi' and it necessarily succeeds the cause. Here, Anubhāva, being an effect, should succeed something. This succession is in view of the sentiment or in view of the permanent emotive mood. Anubhāva cannot succeed Rasa as it is clearly mentioned as a cause for the sentiment. In the Kārikā *'Vibhāvairanubhāvaiśca'* etc., the instrumental case clearly shows that it is a cause for the sentiment and whichever is the cause should

precede the effect. Hence the effectiveness of Anubhāva cannot be with reference to the sentiment as it should precede the sentiment.

'Nanu kāryatvaṁ nāma niyatottarakālabhāvitvam. Taccānubhāvasya kiṁ rasapekṣaya? uta sthāyyapekṣaya? Nādyah. Vibhavairanubhavaiśca iti karaṇa tṛtiyayā tasya purvabhāvitvapratīteḥ. Niyatapūrvavartitva lakṣaṇakaraṇa viśeṣatvat karaṇasya' [11]

He further questions whether the instrumental case refers to the agent in accordance with the sutra - *'Kartṛkaraṇayostṛtiyā'*. If such a position is also accepted, then there is the defect Anyonyāśraya, for, it means : when there is Anubhāva there is the production of the sentiment, and when there is the sentiment there has to be the production of Anubhāva. The second view that Anubhāva succeeds the Sthāyi is not acceptable, for, the Anubhavas side glances etc.,, form the cause for rousing the Sthāyī lying embeded in the minds of the connoisseurs. Hence it has to be understood that the Anubhāva here is an effect of the moods Rati etc., as observed in the world and the same acts as a cause in rousing the moods Rati etc., that are in dorment condition in the minds of the connoisseurs. In support he quotes the following verse :

Bhṛūvikṣepa kaṭākṣādi vikārohṛdayasthitam ।

Bhāvam vyanakti yassoyam anubhāva ītiritaḥ ।। [12]

Bringing out the distinction between Anubhāvas and Sāttvikabhāvas, Vidyānātha makes the following observation :

"Paragata sukhadibhāvanābhāvitāntaḥ karaṇatvam sattvam tato bhavāḥ sāttvikāḥ" [13]

Though Sāttvikabhāvas also can be included under Anubhāvas they have got a distinctive feature. They are directly related to the internal organ, i.e., the mind influenced by the contemplation of

happiness, grief etc., related to others. This direct relationship is not there in the ensuents like side-glances. Hence, they have been separately mentioned. Kumārasvāmin elaborately explains this point in his commentary. He observes: *'Anubhāvatvasāmānye satyapyeṣam pṛthaktayā lakṣaṇam sattvajatvāt'.* [14]

Here, he mentions another school which explains Sāttvikabhāvas in a different way. According to this school, Sattva is of the form of potency which is capable of bringing about direct experience of the sentiments. As these Bhāvas are born out of such potency they are called Sāttvikabhāvas. A third school is also mentioned in this context. According to this school, all the ensuents (Anubhāvas) as a matter of fact, are born from Sattva itself. Still as is the case with the words 'Paṅkaja' etc., Stambha etc., are only called Sāttvikabhāvas, as they are the cases of Yogarūḍha. There exists a fourth school also. Following the Vaiśeṣika school of Kaṇāda, they hold that in Alaṅkāraśāstra, the word Sāttvika has its sense established only in the eight ensuents Sthambha etc.The next topic dealt with, is that of the Vyabhicāribhāvas (transient moods). Somapīthin in his gloss observes-

'Viśeṣādābhimukhyena caranto vyabhicāriṇaḥ' [15]

This is the general definition applying in all the 33 transient moods, 'nirveda' etc. The relationship between the sentiments and these moods, is well brought out in the following statement of Somapīthin :

'Kallolāḥ sāgarasyeva ratyādeḥ laukikasya paripoṣakatayā sahakāriṇassantaḥ nāṭyādau vyabhicāriṇa ityucyante' [16]

Clearly demarcating the scopes of Vibhāvas, Anuhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas, Vidyānātha brings in the analogy well known in the world. It is one's experience that for an effect that the moods Rati etc., have their own set of causes, ancillary causes and effects. To be

clear, it is within one's experience that the moods anger etc., even in the world have relation with these three factors. What are the causes for a particular mood in the world are known by the term Vibhāvas. The effects are disignated as Anubhāvas the ancilliary causes.

'Kāraṇānyatha kāryāṇi sahakāriṇi yāni ca
ratyādeḥ sthāyino loke tānicennātyakāvyayoḥ
Vibhāvaścānubhāvaśca kathyante Vyabhicāriṇah' [17]

The change of the nomenclature is due to the fact that the sentimental relisation (Rasapratīti) in Poetry is different from the experiences of day to day life. Here Somapīthin raises an interesting issue. The functions attributed to Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas are not constant since sometimes an Uddīpana Vibhāva may be the effect of the sentiment and hence can be treated as an Anbubhāva [18]. Similarly the ensuents like side glances, since they generate Rati, have to be designated as Vibhāvas. Both these, since they nourish the sentiments have to be taken as trasnient moods. To add, almost all the transient moods like Cintā, as they can be the effects of Rati, have to be treated as ensuents. Hence no specific demarcation can be shown in respect of Vidhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas based on their functions. That is why even the Bhāvaprakāśa of Śāradātanaya admits this fact :

"Vibhāvopyanubhāvassyadanubhāvo vibhāvavat |

Tau punaścārinau syātāṁ te ca tau syuḥ parasparam" [19] ||

Somapīthin meets this objection as follows :The overlaping of the functions of the above mentioned three factors arises only when two or more persons are taken into consideration. In the case of a single individual there is no overlaping of this kind. It is only when these are studied with respect to another person, there is this kind of anamoly. In the world, we find the same person is son with respect to one and

father with respect to another. Similar is the case here too. Hence there is no admixture of functions for Vibhāva, Anubhāva etc.[20] Vidyānātha observes that the sentiments Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Adbhuta are best delienated only in the case of a hero of a very noble type. If these are described in the case of low-born and ill-bred people, then the sentiments degenerate into their Ābhāsas. That is why when Śṛṅgāra as related to an ill-bred person is described assumes the semblance of the sentiment. This Śṛṅgārābhāsa, according to earlier writers is of three types :

'Ekatraivānurāgaśćet tiryan melccha gatopi vā |

Yoṣito bahusaktiśćet rasābhāsastridhā mataḥ' [21]

Śāradātanaya also endorses this view :

'Bhāgadvayam praviṣṭhasya pradhānasyaikabhāgataḥ I

Rasānāṁ dṛśyate yattat tatsyādābhāsa lakṣaṇamiti' [22] II

According to this school, if Poetry depicting Śṛṅgāra is full of comic incidents, Śṛṅgāra has its semblance only at that place. Thus, one sentiment occupying a prominent position in the description of the contextual sentiment effects it and the contextual sentiment degenerates into its Ābhāsa. So, whenever a particular sentiment is desired to be depicted as prominent the other sentiments should necessarily occupy a subordinate position accepting the supremacy of that particular sentiment. Vidyānātha next turns his attention to transient moods and observes that they can be depicted in four ways. Here, he quotes the Daśarūpaka :

"Bhāvasya śāntirudayaḥ sandhiḥ śabalatā tathā."[23]

Having explained the Sthāyibhāvas (permanent emotive moods), Anubhāvas (ensuents) and the Vyabhicāribhāvas (transitory moods),

Vidyānātha proceeds to define and illustrate them individually.

1. RATI (LOVE) :

The desire for the union between the lovers is called Rati [24]. The reciprocal sights of the youth, embraces etc., will come under the purview of the Sambhoga. The mental state about that act and their auxiliaries such as the touch are said to be Rati. In the illustrated verse "Śṛṅgāraikarasaḥ" [25] etc., it is said that a particular heroine delights in having Pratāparudra, who is superior to the cupid himself, as her husband. Here Nāyikā is the Ālambanavibhāva. Her words that he is superior to Cupid etc., suggest her joy in getting such a beloved. Here in this verse her love for Pratāparudra is finally suggested.

2. HĀSA (HUMOUR) :

Hāsa is a changed set up of the mind caused by the sight of disfigured objects etc. [26] In the illustrative verse [27] it is said that the kings who disguised themselves as women were caught by the Viṭas. The Viṭas removed their veils, caught hold of their artificial breasts and came to know their true form. Here the Vitas are Ālambanavibhāvas, their deeds are Uddīpanas and the laugh is Anubhāva.Tears due to the excessive laugh is Sāttvikabhāva and the disgust is Vyabhicārin. All these elements coupled with the permanent emotive mood Hāsa suggest the sentiment Hāsya. As different from other sentiments Hāsya is spoken of two kinds, viz., Ātmastha and Parastha. When a comic scene is directly enjoyed by the spectator in a drama then the sentiment Hāsya is said to be Ātmastha. If the spectator derives his pleasure having seen a third person on the stage who appears to enjoy the sentiment, then the sentiment Hāsya is Parastha. It would be better here to take this instance as illustrating the first type of Hāsya. Giving details in his commentary Kumārasvāmin speaks of Hāsa as of six kinds. First the distinction is made on the basis of the status of the spectator. They

are of three kinds as Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama. In the case of Uttama, the two types mentioned are Smita and Hasita. In the case of Madhyama, Vihasita and Uddhasita occur. In the case of Adhama, Apahasita and Atihasita are mentioned. Thus Hāsya is of six kinds.

3. ŚOKA (GRIEF) :

Śoka is defined as abundant grief caused by the separation of one's beloved etc.[28] In the illustrative verse "Dhātarniṣkaruṇosi sikṣayasi" etc.,[29] a pathetic situation of the wives of the enemy-kings of Pratāparudra has been described touchingly. Here, the women of enemy-kings are Ālambana vibhāvas, their state which is said to be the embodiment of suffering is Uddīpana, their acts such as beating their chests and rolling on the ground are Anubhāvas, their tears and the change in their tone etc., are Sāttvikabhāvas, the pain, the lust and pathos they experience at that time are Vyabhicārins. The total assemblage of these elements when united with the permanent emotive mood Śoka results in the sentiment Karuṇa.

4. KRODHA (WRATH) :

The enragement of the mind due to the insults caused by the enemies is designated as Krodha [30]. Here, in the illustrative verse, 'Re re sevaṇa' etc.,[31] the act that enrages one is the crossing of the river Godāvari and entering the domain of Pratāparudra. The chiefs are Ālambana, the sight of the enemies is Uddīpana, roaring etc., are Anubhāvas and the horripulation is Sāttvikabhāva, the pride and the anger (amarṣa) are Vyabhicārins. The combination of all these elements along with the Sthāyibhāva Krodha, produces the sentiment Raudra.

Somapītin speaks of Krodha as of three types - Krodha, Kopa and Roṣa. The first variety, however, has been given the generic name Krodha which may some times lead to doubt or confusion.

5. UTSĀHA (FORTITUDE) :

A constant effort for achieving extrordinary results is called Utsāha [32]. In the verse which is given as example [33], the army of Āndhras are Ālambanas, the sights of the enemies' army is Uddīpana, their speech and their acts are Anubhāvas, elements like pride are Vyabhicārins. This combination which arouses Utsāha leads to the sentiment Vīra (Heroic). Bharata mentions this as having three types.

"Dānavīram yuddhavīram dhrmavīram tathaivaca |

Rasam vīra mapi prāha brahmā trividhasammatam". | | [34]

Dhanika, however, speaks of Dayavira instead of Dharmavira.

6. BHAYA (TERROR) :

The apprehension of some evil on account of seeing fearful objects is Bhaya [35]. In the illustrative verse "Dūrādākarṇya Viśvaprasṛmaramahaso" [36] etc., the enemy kings are Ālambana vibhāvas, hearing the sounds of battle drums is Uddīpana, the frightening sights are Anubhāvas, shivering, sweat etc., are the sāttvikabhāvas, suffering, panic are the Vyabhicārins. The permanent emotive mood Bhaya with this equipment gets transformed into the sentiment Bhayanaka. This permanent emotive mood of terror is natural for women and timid people. For others, however, this is artificial. This view, however, is held by Hemacandra and Śāradātanaya. Siṅgabhūpāla, however, accepts its being artificial in all cases.

7. JUGUPSĀ (DISGUST) :

The aversion caused by seeing the defects in objects is Jagupsā [37] In the verse which is given as an illustration "Viṣvaṅmastiṣkapaṅke" etc. [38] the dead elephants etc., are the Ālambanas, the bad smell

caused by them is Uddīpana spitting, closing the eyes and nose as such are the Anubhāvas. Fainting, delirium and disease are Vyabhicārins. Jugupsā caused by the combination of these elements results in the sentiment Bībhatsa.Bhāvaprakāśa mentions the mood Jugupsā as having two kinds - Kṣobha and Udvega. Dhanika adds a third variety born out of a spirit of renunciation.

8. VISMAYA (SURPRISE) :

The expansion of one's mind caused by the sight of most-wonderful things is Vismaya [38]. In the illustrative verse [40], the acts such as sprinkling of eyes and eye-brows are Anubhavas, Horripulation etc., are the Sāttvikabhāvas and the delight etc., are the Vyabhicārins. Vismaya caused by the combination of these elements results in the sentiment Adbhuta.

9. ŚAMA (TRANQUILITY) :

A changeless state of mind on account of detachment etc., is called Śama [41]. In the verse of illustration, [42] the intelligentia, who have the conviction that the worldly pleasures are worthless, are the Ālambana vibhāvas, the abode of Kākatīya kingdom which can be compared to that of a holy hermitage is Uddīpana, the natural acts that they make are Anubhāvas, Horripulation and the like are Sāttvika bhāvas where as Nirveda and Harṣa are Vyabhicārins. The cessation caused by these elements when it is contemplated becomes the sentiment Śānta.

Somapīthin takes up the crucial discussion about the number of Rasas. According to Bharata's text Rasas are only eight in number, excluding Śānta spoken by later writers. Following Mammaṭa, Vidyānātha mentions Śānta as the ninth Rasa. In support of Vidyānātha, Somapīthin goes into the intricacies of the problem and establishes Śānta as the ninth Rasa. Here he raises several points of doubt against accepting Śānta as one of the sentiments.

1. Does Śānta fail to be a sentiment as Bharata did not mention Śama as its sthāyibhāva ?

2. Is it on account of lack of equipment?

3. Or on account of lack of appreciation from the connoisseure?

4. Or on account of its inclusion in the already accepted sentiments ?

5. Or it does not serve any of the four life-ends (Puruṣārthas)?

The first is not acceptable for, Bharata appears to accept Nirveda as the Sthāyibhāva for Śānta. The very fact that Nirveda, an inauspicious mood, has been mentioned in the very beginning, indicates this view of Bharata. Even Mammaṭa endorses this view[43]. Ānandavardhana too subscribes to this view. He observes:

'Tṛṣṇakṣaya sukhasya yaḥ pariposastallakṣaṇo rasaḥ pratīyata eva'[44]

Even Abhinavagupta admits this. There is a state of blissful nature where there is cessation of all desires that very state is Śama and in quotations like:

'Yacca kāmasukham loke yacca divyam mahatsukham
Tṛṣṇakṣaya sukhasyaite nārhatassodaśīm kalām' etc.[45]

it is clearly pronounced as a blissful state.

The second doubt has no basis for, the equipment Vairagya etc., is well known. In this case detachment, enquiry after the truth etc., are Vibhāvas and the Yama, Niyama, etc., are Anubhāvas. Mati, Smṛti, Cinta etc., are Vyabhicārins. Thus there is enough equipment for Sama to develop as Śānta. Coming to the third doubt, though people with sullied minds may not be able to appreciate it, for those who are

having the detached spirit, this is highly relishable. As a matter of fact, even Śṛṅgāra is not relished by a section of the people who are detached to sensual pleasures. If Śānta is denied a place among sentiments since a section of the people does not like it, then Śṛṅgāra also deserves to be deleted. Hence, this doubt is baseless. Coming to the fourth doubt, one has to observe that Śānta cannot be included under any of the eight sentiments. The possible cases, Sompaīthin raises are Śṛṅgāra and Vīra. Śānta cannot be included under Śṛṅgāra as one is of the form of cessation of Rāga or attachment while the other is of the form of attachment. Hence no inclusion. The doubt that Vīra may contain Śānta is also untenable for, one is of the form of enthusiasm while the other has no trace of it. The fifth issue also can be refuted. The fourth life-end i.e., liberation or Mokṣa can be attained only through Śānta. Thus none of the objections raised against Śānta as Rasa is valid. So to accept Śānta as ninth Rasa would be proper and logical.

Next Vidyānātha illustrates Ālambanavibhāva, Uddīpana Vibhāva and Anubhāva. Though the illustrations for all the Ālambana vibhāvas of all sentiments are to be depicted, due to the fear of prolixity of the text, Vidyānātha observes, that he is dealing with the Erotic sentiment only. In the verse which is given as an example for the Erotic, the heroine who is most beautiful in the world and the hero Pratāparudra who can be compared with the Cupid are Ālambanavibhāvas. The delight for which the hero and heroine are said to be the substratum and Śṛṅgāra which is generated by the description is to be relished by the cannoisseur. In the verse "Uromātrotsedham..." etc.,[46] Vidyānātha describes the youth of a lady which comes under Uddīpanavibhāva. The verse given for Anubhāva is "Smarasmerān mandasmita" etc.[47]. According to this it is clear that the side-glances of the heroine are directed towards the hero and they are expressive of the desire for union with the hero.

Next, Vidyānātha defines and illustrates the Sāttvikabhāvas.

SĀTTVIKABHĀVAS

1. STAMBHA (STUPOR) :

The actionless state of the limbs either due to excessive love or fear is stambha [48]. In the illustrative verse it is said that the ladies were like statues at the sight of Pratāparudra. This is on account of the pining due to the arrows of cupid.

2. PRALAYA (SWOON) :

The uncounscious state due to the excessive pleasure or pain is called Pralaya [48]. Kumārasvāmin adds that this state may occur by intoxication or by a blow. In this connection, he quotes the definition of some other author which runs:

'Vākkaya manasāṁ prāyaḥ pralayo naṣṭaceṣṭatā' [50]

He also says that the example given by Vidyānātha suggests this state due to pleasure.

3. ROMĀÑCA (HORRIPULATION) :

The horripulation caused by immense pleasure is called Romāñca[51]. Kumārasvāmin adds enthusiasm fear and astonishments also as the factors for this state[52].

4. VEPATHU (TREMBLE) :

The physical shivering caused either by love or by wrath or by fear is called Vepathu. Vidyānātha substantiates the illustration of these two Sāttvikabhāvas in a single verse, the first half for Vepathu and the latter half for Romāñca [53].

5. SVEDA (PERSPIRATION) :

The sweat on the body caused by alliance, heat or fatigue is called Sveda. Kumārasvāmin extends the list of the causes by adding

exhaustion due to summer, delight, exercise, bashfulness fear and wrath. A desire to take up a fan for having the breeze is said to be the Anubhāva for this state. It is said in the illustrative verse that a particular heroine gets sweat on hearing the love message from her lover. The poet fancies that it is as it were she was anointed[54].

6. VAIVARṆYA (PALLOR) :

A change in the colour of the complexion due to grief, intoxication and anger is called Vaivarṇya . In the verse given as an example, it is stated that the Nāyikā has grown pale contemplating the bright qualities of Pratāparudra [55].

7. AŚRU (TEARS) :

The tears caused by grief or anger by ecstasy are considered to be Aśru. Kumārasvāmin says that fear and yawning are also may be the causes for this state. In the illustrative verse the tears of the wife of an enemy-king due to the death of her husband are described [56]. While the tears due to suffering culminate into the sentiment Pathos, the tears caused by ecstasy culminate into the sentiment Erotic.

8. VAISVARYA (CHANGE OF VOICE) :

The faltering in the tone caused by high intoxication etc., is designated as Vaisvarya [57].

Kumārasvāmin, however, adds that this state may arise due to joy, grief, fear, fever, etc., [58]. It is described that a Nāyikā could not speak to her beloved in her natural tone, and as such it is to be inferred that this change in her voice may be caused by delight.

Thus having dealt with the eight Sāttvikabhāvas in brief, Vidyānātha proceeds to define and illustrate the Vyabhicāribhāvas.

VYABHICĀRIBHĀVAS

1. NIRVEDA (DESPAIR) :

Nirveda is the mood of futility borne out of grief, jealousy and the knowledge of the truth. Here the ensuents are meloncholy mood, tears, sighs and dejection. Kumārasvāmin adds a note that by the virtue of the particle "ca", we can take ensuents like Pallor etc. [59]

In the illustrative verse it is described that the heroine gets disinterested for the things like camphor. Grief is the root cause for this disinterestedness. This is expressed through tears and sighs.

2. GLĀNI (EXHAUTION) :

The weakness which causes the change of colour and disinterestedness is Glāni. A woman's speech in herself in praise of her capacities is given as an example. The perspiration, sighs etc., which are Anubhāvas are the expressive tools for her mood [60].

3. ŚAṄKĀ (APPREHENSION) :

Apprehension is explained as a thought that something evil may happen. In the illustrative verse it is said that a lady who wants to keep the affair of her love a secret, is afraid that her intentions are made public by the horripulation all over her body. The frightened sights which are Anubhāvas are the expressive media of this state [61].

4. ASŪYĀ (JEALOUSY) :

Jealousy towards other's prosperity is said to be Asūyā.A beloved of the king Pratāparudra thinks that the beloved Earth (Bhūnāyikā) is no way superior to herself. If king is attached to her, it is because of her good fortune. Here, the jealousy has been expressed and as such it is a case of Asūyā. Breaking the lips, nodding the head are the possible Anubhāvas by which this is expressed [62].

5. MADA (INEBRIETY) :

The intoxication which is created by taking liquors is considered as Mada. The reddishness of the eyes, delirious speech, unnatural laugh are the Anubhāvas by which this is expressed. In the illustration given, the behaviour of a lady who is intoxicant is described. The ensuents described here are irrelevant talk and big laughter [63].

6. ŚRAMA (EXHAUTION) :

The fatigue caused by the physical labour such as walking is called Śrama. The woman who is anxiously awaiting the arrival of Pratāparudra walks hither and thither and on account of this, she sweats and her consmetics are washed off. Āvega and Sveda are the Vyañjakas of it [64].

7. ĀLASYA (SLOTH) :

Sluggishness in one's duties is Ālasya. The heroine is causing delay in getting herself ready for the union of her lover. Acts such as yawning are its ensuents [65].

8. DAINYA (DEPRESSION) :

The humility on account of dejection is designated as Dainya. A lady who becomes weak by the gravity of the pangs of separation and is afraid of the moon rise, prays the cupid to ask the moon not to rise early and hence it is an illustration of Dainya.Speaking in a pitious way, folding hands are the Anubhāvas, by which it could be expressed[66]

9. CINTĀ (MELANCHOLY) :

Cintā is meloncholy on account of not obtaining one's desired object. A state of being unable to think and the anxiety are the Anubhāvas by which it seeks its expression. A woman having not seen

the elders standing thereby, fails to answer though questioned. She simply goes after her mind attached to her lover. Pitious talk, uncleanliness of the body etc., are the ensuents [67].

10. MOHA (SWOON) :

Grief and fright by which one gets fainted is Moha. Here, the state of unconsciousness mistaking, delirium and loss of sight are the Anubhāvas. It is said in the illustrative verse that a heroine fainted because of the excessive pangs of separation and hence this amounts to Moha [68].

11. SMṚTI (RECOLLECTION) :

Recollection of the past events is said to be smṛti. Moving of the winkles and nodding of the head are the possible Anubhāvas. In the verse given for illustration it is said that a woman recollects the happiness due to the single touch of Pratāparudra and as such it is a case of Smṛti [69].

12. DHṚTI (CONTENTS) :

Dhrti is considered to be the state of desirelessness due to the fulfilment of the desires and real knowledge of the things. Attcutivity is the Anubhāva for it. The woman, in the illustrative verse, thinks that the world is futile on account of her having been united with Pratāparudra [70].

13. VRĪDĀ (BASHFULNESS) :

The contraction of the mind on account of love or praise is said to be Vrīḍā. A lady gets bashfulness by the sight of the king Pratāparudra. So this is the bashfulness caused by love. Bending of the head, disappearance, paleness etc., are the Anubhāvas [71].

14. CAPALATĀ (INCONSISTENCY) :

Capalatā is said to be the inconsistency due to love, hatred or jealousy etc. Threatening, cruelty and unrestricted behaviour etc., are its ensuents. It is said in the illustrative verse, that a woman laughs with bashfulness due to love for the king and some other times she adjusts her necklace of pearls without any reason and at some other times she adjusts the lotus which is the ornament for the ears and as such she is unsettled [72].

15. HARṢA (JOY) :

Joy on account of the arrival of the beloved, the brith of a son etc., is called Harṣa. Perspiration, the tears of joy and shivering are the possible ensuents. The woman gets excessive joy as she was garlanded by Pratāpurudra and the garland won by Pratāparudra himself had double fragrance due to musk. The lady addresses her breasts congratulating them on this event [73].

16. ĀVEGA (AGITATION) :

The agitation of the mind caused by the advent of either favourable or unfavourable circumstances is Āvega. Joy, grief, haste, stupefaction are the ensuents. In the illustrated verse, the women of the city are described to be agitated by seeing the king who passes through the streets of the city. So in their agitation they left their make-ups incomplete and wore their ornaments in irrelevant places and they are in a hurry while climbing the steps in order to have a vision of the king [74].

17. JAḌATĀ (STUPOR) :

The state of non-cognisance born out of desirable or undesirable events is said to be Jaḍatā. In this state the person is unable to decide what to do. Passiveness is the Anubhāva. In the illustrated verse it is

said that a woman, on acćount of her excessive joy,due to the suprise visit of the king forgets to receive him. In such a state she does neither moves about nor desists from moving [75].

18. GARVA (CONCEIT) :

Self boasting resulting from belittling others and born out of physical strength, earning etc., is known as conceit or Garva. Discarding others and walking in a special gait are the Anubhāvas. The armies of Āndhradesa praise themselves for their valour and rebuke the army of the enemies in the illustrative verse. This is suggested by their over-bold talk [76].

19. VIṢĀDA (DESPONDENCY) :

Despondency is the mood where there is frustration on account of lack of means to achieve the desired object. This, the commentator adds, is of two kinds - according to the type of person involved, whether he is Uttama, Madhyama or Adhama. The ensuents here, are searching for the means, mood of dejection and drying up of the mouth. In the illustrative verse, it is said that the Nāyikā has no hope of sending her thoughts for her lover as they are already with him.To add to the trouble, the cupid is not leaving her. Hence, she is in a mood of despondency [77].

20. AUTSUKYA (EAGERNESS) :

Not being able to spend time is eagerness, or Autsukya. It produces ensuents like hesitation and unhappiness. The lady in the illustrative verse is said to bear with the delay in the arrival of the king with much difficulty. Kumārasvāmin adds, this mood is born from the desire to see beautiful things when there is separation from one's beloved[78].

21. NIDRA (SLUMBER) :

Contraction of the mind is slumber. The ensuents here are, according to Kumārsavāmin, yawning stretching one's limbs, closure of the eyes etc. In the illustrative verse there is a description of a lady who stretches her arms in space in order to embrace her lover who appeared in her dream [79].

22. APASMĀRA (CATALEPSY) :

The state of outburst on account of grief and delusion is known as Apasmāra, and this generates pain for the body. In the verse given as an example, it is said that the enemy kings are frightened by seeing Pratāparudra in their dreams. Running, rolling on the ground, crying for help are the possible outlets for the expression of this state [80].

Kumārasvāmin adds impurity, unadjustability of the Dhatus, and possession by devils also lend scope to this state. Its ensuents are falling on the ground, roaming about, patting the shoulders, speaking irrelevantly, emitting of water from the mouth etc. [81]

23. SUPTI (DEEP SLEEP) :

Deep sleep is called Supti. The sound of milky ocean disturbed on account of moon light is incapable of breaking the sleep of Lord Viṣṇu. This is on account of his being peaceful due to the reign of Pratāparudra. The ensuents are long sighs, closure of the eyes etc.[82].

24. VIBODHA (WAKEFULNESS) :

Awakening from the sleep is Vibodha. Yawning, pressing of the eyes and raising of the arms are its ensuents [83].

25. AMARṢA (WRATH) :

Anger is defined as the burning of one's mind due to culprits that

commit blunder. Sweating, nodding of the head, frightening etc., are the ensuents. The armies exhibit anger for the onward march of the enemies. This may be expressed by insulting speech and huge cries etc.[84]

26. AVAHITTHA (DISIMULATION) :

Concealment of the symptoms of happiness is called Avahittha. Misleading and the show of one's own confidence which is artificial are the Anubhāvas. It is said that a lady having the exploits of Pratāparudra from women in the assembledge, scratches the earth with face bend down [85].

27. UGRATĀ (ACRIMONY) :

Ugratā is defined as flared-up state when an insult was meted out. The ensuents are threatening etc. A woman who is suffering with the pangs of separation is further tormented by the moon.On account of her angry side-looks the moon has turned back [86].

28. MATI (DETERMINATION) :

A clear decision of something after much deliberation of the facts is determination. Inculcation for a disciple, clearance of a doubt, dexterity in action and self-satisfaction are the ensuents. In the illustrative verse it has been declared that the king Pratāparudra is moon himself. This is valid in view of the fact that the organs of the heroine behave as moon stones on account of his touch [87].

29. VYĀDHI (ILLNESS) :

Illness is defined as fever etc., caused by mental agony. Kumārasvāmin observes that raise of temperature etc., are the ensuents. In the illustrative verse, the heat related to the fever of the cupid, born in the bodies of the ladies of the enemy kings is completely melting the

ice lying in the Himālayan regions [88].

30. UNMĀDA (MENTAL DERANGEMENT) :

To behave in the same way with regards to the sentients and insentients is Unmāda. Here the laugh, the delirious speech running without any reason and grieving for nothing are the ensuents. In the illustrated verse the enemies who were very much afraid of the war expedition of Pratāparudra underwent delusion and were enquiring the trees about the path they were to take [89].

31. MARAṆA (DEATH) :

Maraṇa is defined as an effort made in order to die. Becoming unable to live with the pangs of separation of her beloved certain lady is indifferent to her life and hence exposes her body to the moonlight and the southern breeze. Here, the ensuents are long sighs etc. [90]

32. TRĀSA (FRIGHT) :

The fear that arouses in the mind due to the thunderbolt or the lightening or by the earthquake is said to be Trāsa. In this, shivering of the body and contraction of the limbs, horripulation and fainting state are the noticeable Anubhāvas. In the illustrative verse, the lady is said to be frightened by the sound of the thunderbolt. The shivering in her body is to be taken as the Anubhāva [91].

33. VITARKA (DUBIOUSNESS) :

The endlessness in decisive thoughts is Vitarka. Here, the ensuents are movement of the eye-brows, nodding of the head etc. In the illustrated verse, the heroine, without taking of the consequences falls in love with the king. Now many questions arise as to how he can be approached, how long the mental agitation has to continue etc [92].

The Sāttvikabhāvas and the Vyabhicārins are common to most of

the sentiments and so the illustration of each Bhāva as occuring in a particular sentiment is avoided. In Śṛṅgāra all the Sāttvika and the Vyabhicāribhāvas have a place. In Hāsya, however, Glāni, Śrma, Capalatā,Harṣa and Avahitta occur. In Karuṇa, except Mada, Dhṛti, Vrīdā, Harṣa, Garva, Autsukya and Ugratā, all other have relevance. In the same way.one finds the absence of Glāni, Śaṅkā, Ālasya, Dainya, Cintā, Vrīdā, Āvega, Jaḍatā, Viṣāda, Supti, Nidra, Apasmāra, Avahitta, Vyādhi, Unmāda,Śáma and Trasa in Raudra. In Vīra also all the Bhāvas that can be present in Raudra occur in addition to Nirveda. In Bhayānaka there is the absence of Asūya, Mada, Dhṛti, Vrīdā, Harṣa, Garva, Nidrā, Supti, Amarṣa, Avahitta and Ugratā. In Bibhatsa and Adbhuta, Cintā and Trāsa are possible to occur.

Now a presentation of the different kinds of behaviour connected with the Erotic sentiment follows. They are eighteen in all viz., Bhāva, Hāva,Helā, Mādhurya, Dhairya, Līlā, Vilāsa, Vicchitti, Vibhrama, Kilikiñcita, Mottāyita, Kuṭṭamita, Bibboka, Lalita, Kutūhala, Cakita, Vihṛta and Hāsa. Of these the first five are the mental acts, the rest being physical. All of them are considered as Anubhāvas. The aesthetes of yore treat them as Uddipanavibhavas because they result in the gestures of the ladies which inspire their counterpart.

1. BHĀVA (FEELING) :

Bhava is defined as the eligibility to realise sentiments. Kumārasvāmin adds that the mental modification related to erotics born from the state of adolescence. In other words it is a Vikāra connected with love which sprouts in the mind by the time of entering the youth. In the illustrated verse it is said that the young girls who sang freely the qualities of Pratāparudra in their childhood feel bashful to do the same in their youth [93].

2. HĀVA (EMOTION) :

Hāva is defined as Bhāva having a modification slightly detected.

This comes to be illustrated when in the above verse we add "Īṣatpulakita" [94].

3. HELĀ (PASSION) :

Helā is defined as a Bhāva whose effects are clearly visible. In the illustrated verse the horripulation all over the body is a clear indictor of love of the lady for Pratāparudra. [95]

4. MĀDHURYA (SWEETNESS) :

Mādhurya is the natural beauty even without ornaments. In the illustrated verse it is said that the lady of transcendental beauty wears ornaments in order to embellish them [96].

5. DHAIRYA (RESTRAINT) :

Dhairya is defined as not transgressing the principles of character. In the illustrated verse it is said that a particular lady who was attracted by the qualities of Pratāparudra, exercised her restraint keeping in view the principles of character and lineage. [97]

6. LĪLĀ (SPORTIVENESS) :

Līlā is imitating the words, gait and deeds of one's lover. In the illustrated verse it is said that the Nāyikā Lakṣmī imitating the king Pratāparudra became most devoted one among his wives. [98]

7. VILĀSA (MOMENTARY CHANGE) :

Vilāsa is defined as a temporary change when one's lover is seen. In the illustrative verse it is said that a lady gets horripulation by just seeing Pratāparudra [99].

8. VICCHITTI (DECENCY) :

Vicchitti is defined as to be most beautiful even with scanty

ornaments [100]

9. VIBHRAMA (FLUSTER) :

Vibhrama is the confusion characterised by the wearing of ornaments in improper places. In the illustrated verse it is said that the lady wore her anklets on her hands and the bracelets on her feet [101].

10. KILIKIÑCITA (DELIGHT) :

Kilikiñcita is a state where anger, grief, fear and bashfulness are assembled. In the illustrative verse it is said that the heroine got fear, bashfulness and trembling voice when she was caught by the king Pratāparudra [102].

11. MOTTĀYITA (MANIFESTATION) :

Mottāyita is a state where one indicates her desire to listen to the interesting stories. In the illustrative verse it is said that a lady who listens to the sweet life-incidents of Pratāparudra more expresses her feelings by the concealment of her body than by the horrippulation [103].

12. KUṬṬAMITA (PRETENTION) :

Kuṭṭamita is a state of happinss during coition despite friction. Sompāithin adds that lip-biting and grasping of locks of hair known to give pain, are said to cause internal happiness. This state of happiness itself is Kuṭṭamita. In the illustrative verse it is said that the organs of lady are indicative of the immense activity during coition. She becomes bashful that her friends came to detect the same [104].

13. BIBBOKA (AFFECTED INDIFFERENCE) :

Bibboka is a slight disregard concerning the affair of the lover. Somapīthin adds that this is just an indication and the definition can also mean disregard of the heroine for the hero on account of arrogance and other factors. In the illustrative verse, the heroine is said

to have disregard for the appeals made by the king in view of the fact that he is attached to many heroines [105].

14. LALITA (GRACEFULNESS) :

Lalita is the delicate gait of the limbs. In the illustrated verse the servīce is rendered by the ladies to the king has been well described [106].

15. KUTŪHALA (INQUISITIVENESS) :

Kutūhala is the fickleņess to witness a beautiful thing. The ladies of the city are hasty in getting up the stairs in order to see the king who is on a visit to the city [107]

16. CAKITA (FLURRY) :

Cakita is the disturbance due to fear. It is said in the illustrated verse that the king made a sudden visit and this caused flurr for the heroine [108].

17. VIHRTA (RESERVE) :

Vihrta is a state where one cannot speak due to bashfulness inspite of the necessity. In the illustrated verse it is said that the lady kept quite when her friend asked her to touch the lil y garland of Pratāparudra with her breasts [109].

18. HASITA (SMILE) :

Hasita is a sudden laugh born of youth. Kumārasvāmin adds that this laugh should not be on account of queer dress and speech. In the illustrated verse it is said that the lady laughs for no reason as she is caught by the resplendence of her youth [110].

There are twelve states which are popularly known as Manmathāvasthas. These states are described in the context of love-in-separation. These are the causes for the four main stages of

sprouting (Aṅkuritattva), bearing tender leaves (Pallavitattva) bringing forth flowers (Kusumitattva) and finally bearing fruit (Phalitattva). Just as the seed sprouts, grows into a plant and so on, so the Rati also with its causal equipment of Vibhāva etc., gradually develops into a sentiment. The Manmathavasthas are: Cakṣuḥprīti, Manassaṅga, Sankalpa, Pralāpa, Jāgara, Kṛśatā, Arati, Lajjātyāga, Saṁjvara, Unmada, Mūrccha and Maraṇa. Some opine that these are ten in number [111]. In this chapter Vidyānātha defines these states and illustrates them as follows:

1. **Cakṣuḥprīti** is defined as seeing an object with intense desire. In the illustrative verse the heroine describes the beauty of Pratāparudra. He is cupid with form and full moon without the stain[112].

2. **Manassaṅga** is resting of the mind in the beloved. In the illustrative verse the heroine observes that her mind always thinks of Pratāparudra [113].

3. **Saṅkalpa** is the desire for the beloved. In the illustrative verse it is described that the woman is anxiously awaiting the visit of Pratāparudra [114].

4. **Pralāpa** is the prattling of the qualities of the beloved. In the illustrative verse the heroine describes that the king Pratāparudra is unparalleled the qualities, dexterity, sweetness of behaviour and gentleness [115].

5. **Jāgara** is the state of sleeplessness. In the illustrative verse the heroine observes that the day is spent but the night which is unbearable on account of moonlight has approached. The cupid is ready with his weapons, neither sleep nor the king approaches [116].

6. **Kṛśatā** is the emaciation of the body. In the illustrated verse it is said that the ring of the lady has become her bracelet due to the

pangs of separation from Pratāparudra [117].

7. **Arati** is the desirelessness regarding objects or persons exempting the hero. In the illustrative verse it is said that the heroine abuses the creation of the moon, depreciates the efficacy of the southern breeze and is avert to festivities. This is due to extreme love for the king [118].

8. **Vrīḍātyāga** is an attitude bereft of bashfulness. In the illustrative verse, the prattling of the heroine without any sense of decency causes shamefulness for those who are around her [119].

9. **Jvara** is defined as the excess of heat in one's body. In the illustrative verse it is said that the heroine's fever is not remedied by all the cooling effects. She only desires the nector like presence of the king. [120]

10. **Unmāda** and 11. **Maraṇa** are the same as mentioned in the list of Vyabhicāribhāvas [121].

12. **Mūrcha** is defined as a state of no actvity on account of the functionlessness of the outer sense organs. In the illlustrative verse it is said that the heroine in order to see the king with in her introverts her sense organs.

The erotic sentiment is of two types i.e., love in separation (Vipralambha śṛṅgāra) and love in Union (Sambhoga śṛṅgāra) [122]. As the Sambhogaśṛṅgāra has innumerable types like the mutual seeing of the lovers, conversing, embracing and kissing etc., and hence it is considered under one head "Sambhogaśṛṅgāra". In the verse which is given as an example [123]. for this type, Pratāparudra is Ālambana for the body, their solitariness being Uddīpanavibhāva. The suggested joy (by the words of elimination of anger) is the Anubhāva. Stambha etc., which are sugested are Sāttvikabhāvas. With these equipments

Rati becomes fully developed and gets the state of Rasa and then it is treated as Śṛṅgārarasa.

The love in separation or Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra as of four types a based on the factors of desire, envy, separation and journey to a far off place.(Abhilāṣā, Īrṣyā, Viraha and Pravāsa).

1. **Abhilāṣā** is the mutual desire entertained by the hero and the heroine before they are united. In the illustrated verse the heroine feels that conversation with the hero, love dealings with him, and sharing a common bed are beyond her desires. It is enough if the sight of Pratāparudra full of love and affection falls on her [124].

Kumārasvāmin here mentions the view of the author of Rasārṇava Sudhākara regarding the nature of Rati and Prema.

'Ratereva avasthāviśeṣaḥ premādayaḥ'

In the verse "Ankura pallvakalita" etc., this idea has been given[125].

2. **Īrṣyā** is a mental modification caused on account of the hero being attached to another lady. In the illustrative verse it is said that heroines like Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī and Mahī do not like the affectiion of Pratāparudra shown towards the heroine under context. Hence, Īrṣyā, a state of jealousy is suggested here. In support of the definition given by Vidyānātha, Kumārasvāmin quotes from the text Daśarūpaka

'Strīṇāmīrṣyākṛtaḥ kopo manonyāsaṅgin ipriye' [126]

3. **Viraha** is the separation between the hero and the heroine for some reason or the other. In the illustrated verse it is said that the ornaments with their places changed bring beauty only for a moment. Hence, the act of beautification is futile. The only way is to bring the king [127].

4. **Pravāsa** is the state where the hero and the heroine live in different places. In the illustrated verse the ladies of the enemy kings deplore that their husbands are not available to them even in the days of festivities. On account of the painful separation their organs have become lean and weak. The days too are as long as a yuga [128].

It is already mentioned that Rasābhāsa is of three types. Vidyānātha illustrates the type of Rasābhāsa which is the love of animals and birds and leaves the rest two types to the imagination of the readers. In the illustrated verse it is said that the king smiles at the mutual love of the parrot couple. Kumārasvāmin adds that according to some, this too can be taken as a relevant instance of the sentiment Śṛṅgāra. He quotes Vidyādhara in this connection who says :

'Vibhāvādi sambhavo hi rasam prati prayojako na

vibhavadi jñānam. Tataśca tiraścāmapyastyeva rasaḥ'. [129]

Where the love between animals and birds is described it is called Tiryaggata Rasābhāsa. Vidyānātha, does not, however, describe the Ābhāsa for other Rasas and Bhavābhāsas.

The raising of certain mood is "Bhāvodaya". In the illustrated verse it is described that a friend of a particular heroine finds out that the heroine has an amarous feeling for the king Pratāparudra. Knowing this the heroine becomes bashful [130].

The cessation of a mood is "Bhāvaśama'. In the example it is said that the friend of the heroine reconciles the heroine who is angry with the hero. After reconciliation it is said that the face of the heroine was like a fully blossomed lotus. This description suggests the cessation of the mood anger [131].

The third is "Bhāvasanthi" which is the junctu.. of two moods. In the illustrated verse the mood Harṣa related to the sentiment "Vīra" has

been brought into conjunction with the same mood related to the sentiment Śṛṅgāra [132].

The fourth is designated as "Bhāvaśabalatā" because of the assemblage of several moods. In the illustrated verse it is mentioned that the heroine has undergone several moods, non-endurance of time etc. Somapīthin while explaining the mood presented in the verse observes:

'Atra lajjā vitarkena bādhyate. Dainyaṁ viṣādena saṅkā autsukyena. Dhṛtiḥ matyā ityevam anyonyabadhyabādhakabhāvena dvandvāsau bhavantibhāvasabalatāṁ tato gatva matereva pradhānyamādadhāna paramāsvādasthānamityarthaḥ' [133].

RASA SAṄKARA

As the author, Vidyānātha has already spoken on the assemblage of moods (Bhāvasammelana) he next takes up Rasa Saṅkara, a mixture of sentiments. For the assemblage of sentiments of erotic and pathos Vidyānātha gives the folloiwng illustration.

'Āsannepi mahotsave kathamitastyaktvā pravāsam vrajerdhig-

dhikṣāhasamāvayorvighaṭanaṁ kovā vidhiḥkāṅkṣati I

Yitthaṁ svapnanivāritapriyatamā prasthānabuddhistato

buddhva mūrcchati kākatīyanṛpate tvadvairinārījanaḥ.. [134] *II*

Here, the beloved is Ālambana, the nights of solitude are the Uddīpanas. Embraces etc., are the Anubhāvas. Horripulations etc., caused by them are Sāttvikas. Harṣa, Āvega etc., are the Vyabhicārins. With these the enjoyment of the lady converges into the idea of Rasa and as such the sentiment here is erotics. In the same way the deceased husband being the Ālambana, forests etc., are Uddīpanas, falling on the ground etc., are Anubhāvas, tears, Sthambha, Moha

etc., are Sāttvikas and Glāni and Cintā as Vyabhicārins, the Śoka of the enemy ladies has been contemplated (carvaṇa) and thus the sentiment pathos is also present here. According to the context, the appreciation is for pathos and as such it is to be considered as the principal sentiment. Śṛṅgāra being its embellishing factor, it is auxillary. Thus as there is the assemblage of principal and auxillary sentiments, it is designated as Rasasaṅkara.

Vidyānātha illustrates in a verse the assemblage of Raudra and Bībhatsa also in which the kings of Kaliṅga were made Ālambanas for the anger of king Pratāparudra. The sight of the battle field being the Uppīpana, the roars of the armies being Anubhāvas while anger etc., are Vyabhicārins. Thus there is a suggestion of the sentiment Raudra. In the same manner, the dead elephants on the battle ground being Ālambanas swallowing the blood and tearing the viens being Uppīpanas, horripulation etc., being Anubhāvas, Āvega etc., being Vyabhicārins there is the suggestion of the sentiment Bībhatsa. The first impression is that of Bībhatsa and the latter one is Raudra. Thus, here in the assemblage of the sentiments Raudra and Bībhatsa and as such it is a case of Rasasaṅkara [135].

Kumārasvāmin in his commentary raises the doubt whether the ancillary sentiment has developed or not. If developed it cannot be considered ancilliary. If not developed it ceases to be a sentiment. So the concept of a sentiment being auxi-liary is untenable. Answering this, he adds that though a sentiment is developed, there is nothing wrong in its being considered as auxi-liary. In support of this view, he quotes Abhinavagupta who says :

'Aṅgabhūtānyapi rasāntarāṇi svavibhavādisāmagryāṁ svavasthāyām yadyapi labdhaparipoṣaṇi camatkāragocaratāṁ pratipadytane, tathāpi sa camatkārastavatyeva paritusyan na visrāmyati, kintu camatkārāntaramanudhāvati' [135].

Mammaṭa also appears to be of the same view when he says-

'Guṇaḥkṛtatmasaṁskāraḥ pradhānamanuṣajyate I

pradhānasyopakārehi tathā bhūyasi vartate' [137]

RASĀŚRAYA

The sentiment is of two types by name Laukika and Alaukika. Laukikarasa is that in which the youth of this world get the mental states of Rati etc., and they being strengthened by their own causal equipment and attains the state of sentiment. These are considered as sentiments experienced in the world. The pleasure derived by such sentiments is meagre and transient.

The feeling of love in ordinary life is present in Rāma etc. This is presented by a talented actor on the stage. The audience on account of repeated contemplation realise the same mood. Thus it comes to be accepted that the sentiment present in one can result in giving bliss to another by virtue of the above mentioned contemplation. This phenomenon holds good in the case of parents enjoying the play of their children. Alaukikarasa is that in which a connoisseur gets pleasure by reading poetry or witnessing a drama.

Vidyānātha presents a novel view in this connection. According to him the characters Mālati etc., enable the audience to have the cognition of womanhood in general. Similarly the concept of enemyhood arised from the characters Rāvaṇa etc. On account of the general comprehension, the audience happens to recollect his own individual beloved and hence there is nothing wrong in accepting the audience as the substratum of the sentiments. Actor being engaged in action, can never be the recipient of sentiments and though there is a feeling that he too enjoys the sentiments, it is only as a spectator. There is no difficulty in the presentation of ensuents, for, this is possible

by virtue of this practice. Explaining the nature of a spectator Kumārasvāmin quotes from Bhāvaprakāśa:

'Yastuṣṭau tuṣṭimāpnoti śoke śokamupaitica I

Krodhe Kruddho bhaye bhīrussaśreṣṭhaḥ prekṣakaḥ smṛtaḥ'[138] *II*

Supporting the view of Vidyānātha that the spectator happens to recollect his own beloved, Kumārasvāmin observes that the general concept includes a special one too, as the general concept that whereever there is smoke there is fire includes all special cases like the smoke in the kitchen. Even in the depiction of characters Rāma etc., a poet is not capable of visualising Rāma as he is as in the case of the first poet Valmiki. The poet keeps in view a noble character and depicts the character of Rāma adding details conceived by his talent. Even the author of "Śatsāhasri" observes:

'yebhyaśca sāmānyaguṇayogena rasaḥ niṣpadyante' [139]

It may be asked why general concepts themselves be not shown as the causal equipment for the realisation of the sentiment. This is because a spectator can enjoy only through a particular character.

'Viśeṣopadānenaiva śrotṛṇāmāsvādasambhavāt' [140]

This is true even in the case of children playing with chariots made of mud. Somapīthin raises a doubt here. Even accepting that individuals are recollected it is not possible to explain the relisation of sentiments. Answering this point, Somapīthin observes that the spectator comes to possess a cultured attitude inferring the emotions related to the people in the world. Then, having heard poetry, he feels that the characters Rāma etc., are related to him in a general way. The very same character on account of the contemplation of the spectator appears as belonging to the present. This view is acceptable to Bhartṛhari, the author of Vākyapadīya.

'Sabdopahita rupamstan buddhervisayatam gatan I

Pratyaksamiva kamsadin sadhanatvena manyate' [141] *II*

It is known from this that the characters Kamsa etc., have the same effect when described or presented on the stage. It cannot be said that the characters Rama, Sita etc., presenting the erotic sentiment on the stage involve impropriety. This is because the attributes of their being the daughter of Janaka and the son of Dasaratha etc., get obscured and they are presented just as man and woman. The very same characters which are likened to those in the world are designated by the terms Vibhava etc., in a Kavya. When they are made the object of the spectator's contemplation they, as it were, get reflected in the internal organ. The moods Rati etc., though they are worldly in a sense, when contemplated become Sthayibhavas. Thus, Vibhava etc., give a peculiar cognition is neither valid nor erroneous. It is neither of the form of a doubt nor it is the semblance of similarity. Hence, it is called transcendental and is recognised as residing in a spectator. The doubt that it can have another substratum is baseless. If at all another substratum is to be accepted, it can either be the imitator or the imitated. The first is not possible as the imitator is completely engrossed in his action. The second too, cannot stand, for the heroes Rama etc., are no more. If it is argued that the imitator too sometimes feels himself identified with the heroes Rama etc., then he cannot present the ensuents. Vidyanatha, here observes that it is possible due to the practice of the art of acting. Even in the cases where antogonistic sentiments are presented there is no difficulty on account of the dexterity of the poet in depicting them. Sompaithin quotes here the author of Dhvanyaloka who observes:

'Avirodhi virodhi va rasengini rasantare I

Pariposam na netavyastada syadavirodhita' II [142]

Next Vidyanatha takes up the sets of sentiments that are antogonistic to each other. The sentiments Srngara and Bibhatsa, Vira and Bhayanaka,Raudra and Hasya and Hasya and Karuna are accepted sets. Similarly he speaks of one sentiment giving rise to another. Srngaratilaka while dealing with this topic observes that Hasya, Karuna, Adbhuta,.Bhayanaka are born respectively from Srngara, Raudra, Vira and Bibhatsa.

Vidyanatha enumerates the transient moods that occur under each sentiment. He follows Srngaratilaka and quotes the passage relevant here.

Though a single sentiment is chosen as predominent in a Kavya there can be a combination of different sentiments. Where one or more ancillary sentiments are described, keeping some other idea as prominent, there the result is Rasavadalankara. Similarly when a mood is treated subservient to some other idea, Preyolankara results. Where the semblance of sentiments or moods is depicted, Urjasvin is the figure. Here Vidyanatha refers to the view of Ruyyaka, the author of Alankarasarvasva. He observes that Bhavodaya etc., are to be reckoned as different figures.

'Bhavodaya bhavasandhi bhavasabalatasca prthagalankarah' [143]

Vidyanatha declares that the illustrations of these figures will be dealt with in the chapter of figures. But in the printed texts available they are not illustrated.

Summing up the essential characteristics of the sentiments, Vidyanatha present three verses while concluding the chapter on Rasa. The first verse is as follows:

'Gunalankarasri Krtaparikaro bhavavibhavah

Sphuratpradurbhavah Kramagalitavedyantaramatih I

Sukhamva duhkham va nibidayatu yunohsahrdaye

Tvamandanandatma parinamati purno rasabharah II 144

The permanent moods (Sthayibhavas) are well equipped by the charm of poetic merits and figures. As a consequence, they leave their dormentary state and develop into sentiments. This sentiment when enjoyed by a connoisseur result in an unawareness of every other object. In the world, this may generate happiness or misery. But in an artistic creation like drama they result in giving complete bliss to the connoisseur without the touch of unhappiness. The permanent emotive moods like Rati, equipped with the factors like excellences, figures of speech etc., to be revealed in the minds of connoisseurs. When there is such revolation the awareness of the connoisseur regarding the objects around him glides away. Such a mood may increase happiness or sorrow in the worldly experience. Here, in Poetry, however, whatever be the nature of moods, the connoisseur comes to experience a state of perfect bliss which is likened to Brahmananda. Explaining this verse, Somapithin traces five stages in the realisation of sentiments. First, the connoisseur, on account of the four types of Abhinaya exhibited by the actor gets the impression that the actor is Rama himself. Next, there follows identity of experience in the heart of the connoisseur who gets fully absorbed in the music and other attractive features in a drama. On account of this, he is unaware of any other thing except the sentiment and its causal equipment. Then the transcendental experience called Rasa similar to the experience of a yogin in his meditation follows. This view of Somapithin finds support from the following oft quoted verse of Mahimabhatta.

'Pathyadatha dhrvaganat tatassampurite rase I

tadasvadabharaikagro hrsyatyantarmukhah ksanam II

tato nirvisayasyasya svarupavasthito nijah I

vyajyate hlada nisyando yena tusyanti yoginah' [145] *II*

Distinguishing between the types of experience, one Brahmananda and the other Kavyananda, Somapithin observes that in the former the yogin is aware of nothing while in the latter the causal equipment of the sentiment alone is apprehended. If that is so, how it is said that the experience of Poetry is a united whole? Here, Somapithin brings in the analogy of a drink whose constituent parts are grapes etc. It is to be understood here, that despite the fact one enjoys the drink, one is aware of the presence of the consitutents also.

Commenting on the third line of the verse "Sukham va duhkham va nibidayatu yuno sahrdayah", Somapithin raises a doubt and answers it himself. The doubt here is, in the world the equipment of Srngara is known to give pleasure. That of the Pathos, however, causes grief. In drama, however, both help the connoisseur to have only bliss. The cause for this, has been discussed at length, in Sanskrit Poetics. The decision made by Jagannatha is as follows:

'Ayam hi lokottarasya kavyavyaparasya mahima

yat prayojya aramaniya api sokadayah padarthah ahladamalaukikam janayanti' [146]

Keeping such an idea in view, Vidyanatha observes: ... sahrdayatvamandanandatma parinamati...If it is accepted that even the sentiment Pathos in a drama generates transcendental bliss, then how to explain the tears and other symptoms of grief when one listens to a passage depicting pathos? Somapithin answers this on the analogy of the pleasure derived by women during coition where biting of the lip etc., takes place, still generating pleasure only. Basing on this fact, Alankarikas have accepted "Kuttamita" as one of the

Srngaracestas. Its definition as given by Vidyanatha confirms this view:

'Sammardepi sukhadhikyam ratau kuttamitam matam' [147]

If it is argued that in the situations of pathos one experiences only grief, then great works like Ramayana where Pathos is the main sentiment come to be rejected and connoisserus also do not take to the study of such texts. Therefore, the conclusion would have to be that even in Pathos, one derives pleasure alone as in the case of other sentiments. If all the sentiments happen to give the same type of bliss, then the division of sentiments under nine heads becomes prolix. This is answered as follows: Even the transcendental bliss or Brahmananda is spoken of many types depending upon the delimiting factor (Upadhi) like the moon's reflections on different surfaces. Similarly, here too, depending upon the variety of equipment there is nothing wrong in classifying sentiment as of nine types. [148]

Vidyanatha in the second concluding verse on Rasaprakarana[149], declares that sentiment is the most important element in Poetry and factors like Vibhava etc., take a proper culmination in it. They, along with the Sthayibhava undergo a gradual development to produce the final effect, namely Rasa. This is similar to the threads theat help the creation of cloth.

Explaining the word "Vakyartha", Somapithin observes that "Vakyartha" in a Kavya is always the sentiment, neither an idea nor a figure. The statement of Vidyanatha-

'Raso vakyarthas san vilasati' needs this much of explanation. Here one cannot take 'Vakyartha' in the simple sense 'Vakyasya arthah', meaning, the meaning of a sentence. Earlier writers also have used the term "Vakyartha" in the same sense as Vidyanatha uses it.

'Kavervivakasaya yatra pradhanyam parikalpyate

bhavet sa eva vakyarthah iti nirniyate budhaih' [150]

All the schools are of one view that the sentiments are always suggested and not expressed. The purport in Poetry can be of the form of Sthayibhava or Sattvikabhava or Sancaribhava.

Kumarasvamin quotes :

'Sthayiva sattvikovapi sancari va kvacit kvacit

bhave vakyartha tameti tattad bhava visesatah' [151]

Even Anandavardhana in his Dhvanyaloka and Abhinavagupta in his Locana make this point clear. The equipment Vibhava etc., is neither a Karakahetu nor a Jnapakahetu. Hence, the relationship between the Vibhava etc., and the sentiments is something the like of which is not to be found in the mundane world.

'Ata evalaukikatvamasyeti bhavah' [153]

This idea as explained by Somapithin is suggested by the term "Kila" which occurs in the second of the concluding verses of Rasaprakarana. The sequence between Vibhavadi and Rasa is not discernable, as the act piercing a needle through a set of hundred lotus petals. The equipment coming together developing each other come to be designated by the term Rasa. This is similar to the threads coming together to produce cloth.

The third one, which is also the last verse of Rasa Prakarana brings out the relation between the permanent moods and the transient moods [153]. When ocean is in its full ebbwaves are born and subside. Similarly, when sentiment is in its full swing, the transient moods come and go like the waves. The experience of primary sentiment is akin to the yogic experience and is spoken of as residing in the hero. In a

drama, however, it is present in the connoisseur.

Commenting on this verse, Kumarasvamin clarifies certain points which appear ambiguous. Vidyanatha in his verse uses the word 'Rasa' with the attribute 'nijasvadatirekah'. The following is the comment of Somapithin.

'Nijah svagocara ityarthah Svasmadabhinnasyapi svarupasya svenaiva visayikaranasambhavat. Yadahuh - 'Atmanamatmanyavalokayantam'[154]

Thus, according to him, one becoming the object of self-enjoying is not incongrous. He supports the view that the substratum of the sentiment is connoisseur himself and brings in the views of Abhinavagupta and Saradatanaya that stand to support him. Here, he presents another view that the characteristic of the sentiment to have the connisseur as the substratum is only a superimposed one not to be taken in a real sense.

'Kecidetat samajikasrayatvam aropitam natu mukhyamityahuh[155]

Naraharisuri, a well known writer of his times appears to have this view. According to him it is irrelevant to speak of Brahmananda. This much is the difference while Brahmananda is attainable only through yoga, the bliss that arises from Poetry is on account of the assemblage of Vibhava etc. It is unlike the happiness felt in the world as the causality Vibhava etc., is of a non-mundane type. To support this kind of view, Somapithin quotes from a text Svatmayogapradipa -

'Ya sthayibhava ratireva nimittabhedat

srngara mukhyanavanatyarasibhavanti

Samajikan sahrdayannatanayakadi

nanandayetsahajapurnaraso 'smi so' ham' [156]

Thus the Rasa theory presented by Vidyanatha and explained by Kumarasvami Somapithin gives a clear picture of the view of the earlier writers on the subject like Lollata, Sankuka etc. This theory that Alambanavibhava is the Samavayikarana of the sentiments though goes against the views of the earlier writers can reasonably be explained and defended on the lines shown by Tirumalacarya, the author of the commantary Ratnasana.

CHAPTER - V

DOṢA PRAKARAṆA

Vidyānātha, having dealt with the sentiments, speaks of blemishes that may possibly occur in Poetry. Earlier writers like Daṇḍin do not accept even a slight blemish in Poetry.

"Tadalpamapi nopekṣyaṁ kāvye duṣṭaṁ kathaṁcana" [1]

Hence, Vidyānātha gives priority to blemishes and deals with them before he takes up excellences and figures of speech which bring beauty to Poetry. He further justifies this step saying that knowledge of blemishes is helpful for the clear understanding of the Guṇas. A blemish is one which mars the Poetic beauty. It amounts to saying that whatever delays or hinders the realisation of sentiment is a blemish. This may be found either in word or sense. Vidyānātha presents seventeen types of blemishes pertaining to word (Padadoṣas). It is to be observed here, that he owes much to Bhoja, the author of Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa, when he deals with blemishes and excellences. The first category of blemishes based on word is sub-divided into those pertaining to words and those pertaining to sentences.

. . . . *Doṣānāṁ śabdagatatvena arthagatatvena ca dvaividhyam. Śabdagatānāmapi padavākya gatatvena dvaividhyam'* [2]

PADADOṢAS

1. APRAYUKTA :

The usage of the words that are not used by earlier poets, though they are present in lexicons, constitutes this blemish. The definition of Vidyānātha is almost a reproduction of the definition of Bhoja [3]. In the illustrative verse *'Vimukha daivatāḥ sarve'* etc.,[4] the words Duścavana and Daivata stand as examples. Here the word Duścavana is used in the sense of Indra,[5] which is rare in the writings of the earlier poets. The

word Daivata is used by poets only in neuter gender,[6] though it can be used in masculine gender. Hence the usage amounts to the blemish Aprayukta. However, this kind of usage ceases to be a blemish in the cases of Śleṣa and Yamaka.

This blemish is not found in the works of the earlier writers like Bharata, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Rudraṭa. However, Vāmana speaks of an Ayukta, which he considers as an Arthadoṣa[7] which is not clear. Bhoja is the first man to give a clear cut definition for this blemish. Mammaṭa, Vidyānātha, Viśvanātha and Viśveśvara follow his concept[8]. This can be identified as Apratīta given by Rudraṭa[9].

2. APUṢṬĀRTHA :

The usage of the words whose sense is not applicable to the context is reckoned as the blemish Apuṣṭārtha. While the poet has to say that "the couple of hands are in vain", the poet presents it in a circuitous expression like - Vyarthāsthārdhārdhā bāhūnām" [10]. Hence the blemish here is Apuṣṭārtha. Though most of the terminology of the blemishes based on word is borrowed from the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa, there appears to be some conceptual difference. For instance, Apuṣṭārtha, the second defect, is explained by Vidyānātha as one that occurs where the sense presented is irrelevant (Prakṛtānupayukta). Bhoja, however, defines it as "Yattu tuccābhidheyam syāt apuṣṭārtham taducyate" [11]. Here the word "Tucchābhidheya" as explained by Bhoja and his commentator stands for an instance where the sense that can be presented by few words is presented by many words. Ratneśvara, the commentator, is very clear in his note.

'Stoka śabdābhidheye' arthe bahutara śabda bahulāmityarthaḥ[12]

Thus there is conceptual difference between Bhoja and Vidyānātha.

3. ASAMARTHA :

The definition for the blemish Asamartha as given by Vidyānātha is -

'Yogamātra prasiddhaṁ yat asamarthaṁ taducyate' [13]

Kumārasvāmin in his commentary explains the term "Yogamātra prasiddha" as "Śāstramātra prasiddha". If his explanation is relied upon, then there is no difference between the two blemishes Asamartha and Apratītika. The blemish Apratītika is defined by Vidyānātha as -

'Śāstra mātraprasiddhaṁ yadapratītikamucyate' [14]

Hence, the explanation of Kumārasvāmin deserves to be set aside. If the word "Yoga" in the definition is taken in the sense of Yaugikārtha then the illustrations given by Bhoja and Vidyānātha fit in. Now the difficulty is that there ceases to be any difference betwen the two blemishes Asamartha and Anyārtha. For, the blemish Anyārtha is defined by Vidyānātha as -

'Yadrūḍhi pracyutam nāma tadanyārthamudāhṛtam' [15]

If we compare the two definitions of Bhoja and Vidyānātha, the definition given by Bhoja is precise and unambiguous. Instead of 'Yogamātra prasiddha' he uses 'Asangatam', meaning thereby that the expressions not in accordance with the well established usage of the word come under this blemish. For instance, the sound produced by elephants alone is called "Brnhita" and if it is used in the case of the sound produced by horses then the result is this blemish. Though the definition of Vidyānātha is ambiguous, his illustration shows that he follows Bhoja. In the illustration *'Viṅāyavasudhāmenām'* etc.,[16] the word "Ambudhara" is used to mean ocean, which it is incapable of conveying. Hence this is an instance of Asamartha.

4. NIRARTHAKA :

The word used only to complete the foot of a stanza is Nirarthaka.

5. NEYĀRTHA :

The word which carries a sense mainly depending upon the convention of the poet alone constitutes the defect Neyārtha.

6. CYUTASAMSKĀRA :

The blemish Cyutasamskāra arises where an ungrammatical expression is used.

7. SANDHIGDHA :

If a word conveys sense involving doubt, the blemish is Sandhigdha.

'Vihāya ca gṛhaṁsthānvai vyatyasta navavṛttayaḥ I

Kadā bhaviṣyate vāsaḥ kaṭakeṣu mahībhṛtām [17] *II*

In this verse the word "Vai" has no specific meaning to give and only serves to satisfy the rules of prosody and hence it illustrates the first blemish Nirarthaka. Hemacandra states that according to some, the Nirarthaka ceases to be a blemish if it occurs in the instances of Yamaka [18]. Again the statement *'Vyatyasta navavṛttayaḥ'* illustrates the second blemish Neyartha. Kumārasvāmin sets aside the doubt whether it can be included in Lakṣaṇā. He observes that the two famous varieties of Lakṣaṇā, Rūḍhilakṣaṇa and Prayojanavallakṣaṇā have no place here as there is neither Rūḍhi nor Prayojana. Hence Lakṣanā is out of place here. The convention of the earlier writers as presented in the Kārikā- "Nirūḍhalakṣaṇā kaścid" etc., bars Lakṣaṇa entering such cases. So this is the clear case of the blemish Neyārtha. As regards Cyutasaṁskāra the illustration provided is "Kadā bhaviṣyate Vāsaḥ". Grammar does not admit the usage of the root "Bhū" as Atmanepadi. Hence "Bhaviṣyate" is an ungrammatical usage amounting to the blemish Cyutasaṁskāra. The fourth one Sandhigdha is illustrated in the words Kaṭakesu mahībhṛtām vāsaḥ". This assemblage of words gives rise to two sentences :

i. residing in the capitals

ii. residing on the slopes of the mountains.

So there is scope for doubt and this amounts to the blemish Sandhigdha.

8. APRAYOJAKA :

A word which does not convey any new sense lends scope for the blemish Aprayojaka. In the illustration -

'Hanta vartāmahe vajraghaṭṭanāt prāk calātmasu' [19]

the attribute *'Vajraghaṭṭanāt prāk calātmasu'* is in no way useful for the contextual sense and hence the blemish is Aprayojaka.

9. KLIṢṬA :

The blemish Kliṣṭa arises where the apprehension of the required idea is far fetched and not immediate.

'Nabhasva daśanārāti dhvajāgraja virodhiṣu' [20] is the illustration. Here the whole expression simply means 'on the mountains'. But it is presented in a far fetched way. Hence the blemish here is Kliṣṭa. This is not considered as a blemish in compositions like Prahelikas.

10. GUḌHĀRTHA :

The usage of a word in obsolete sense amounts to the blemish Gūḍhārtha. To illustrate, the word "Soṇita" which is generally used to mean blood, is employed to convey the sense of red colour. Hence the blemish here is Gūḍhārtha.

11. GRĀMYA :

The blemish Grāmya occurs where the usage popular among uncultured people is made. Words like Galla, Kaṭi etc., come under this type. Bhoja calls it Deśya[21].

12. ANYĀRTHA :

Anyārtha is a blemish that occurs where words are used in a sense different from their established sense. The word 'Vidagdha hṛdaya' in the illustration is established in the sense of 'a scholarly mind'. But here it is used in the sense of a 'tormented heart'. Hence it amounts to the

blemish Anyārtha.

13. APRATĪTIKA :

Apratītika is a blemish where a word popular in Śāstraic sense is used in literature to mean the same. In the illustration -

'Manūpadeśaḥ kva gataḥ kulācāryairudīritaḥ' [22]

the word "Manu" is used in the sense of incantation (Mantra) and this denotation is popular only in Śāstras but fails to yield the same sense in popular parlance. Hence it amounts to the blemish Apratītika.

14. AVIMṚṢṬAVIDHEYĀṀŚA :

Vidyānātha defines this blemish as -

'Avimṛṣṭa vidheyāṁśaṁ guṇībhūta Vidheyakam' [23].

He observes that the verse which is given as an example for Apuṣṭārtha illustrates this blemish also. If a thing to be mainly prescribed is made subservient the blemish is Avimṛṣṭa vidheyāṁśa. Here the intention of the poet is to predicate Vaiyarthya. Since the term 'Vyartha' is a member of 'Bahuvrīhi' compound it is subservient.

15. VIRUDDHAMATIKṚT :

The words that convey an altogether opposite sense not intended by the poet amounts to the blemish Viruddhamatikṛt. In the illustration, the intention of the poet in using the word 'Ambikāramaṇa' is to denote lord Śiva. But there is the comprehension of one who dallies with mother, which is not at all intended to be conveyed here. Similarly the words 'Akaryamitra' and 'Vināśa' are employed to convey the two senses 'friends without any cause' and 'pangs of separation'. But the senses they convey are "friends in an unworthy act" and 'destruction'. Hence the blemish here is Viruddhamatikṛt.

16. AŚLĪLA :

In defining this blemish, Vidyānātha follows Mammaṭa. This is of three types.

i. which gives an inauspicious meaning,

ii. which gives a disgustful meaning, and

iii. which gives a meaning that brings bashfulness.

The words "Abhipreta", "Nīcam sadhanam" and "Utsarga" illustrate the three blemishes respectively and hence the three come under Aślīla. Bhoja, however, speaks of the blemish Grāmya as constituting the usage of words that give unpleasant, inauspicious and disgustful senses . Again he sub-classifies these three under three heads. For instance, he speaks of Aślīla as of three kinds.

i. where words conveying indecent sense are employed,

ii. where words having a second sense which is indecent and

iii. words that make one recollect indecent sense.

17. PARUṢA :

Paruṣa is a blemish where we find expressions involving harsh sounds. In the illustration the word "Kārtārthyarthitva" is composed of harsh sounds. This is an impermanent type of blemish, because these harsh sounds are not considered as blemishes in the depiction of the heroic sentiment.

VĀKYA DOṢAS

After dealing with the blemishes based on words, Vidyānātha proceeds to show those that are related to a sentence. An assemblage of defective words amounts to the blemish of a sentence. Vidyānātha enumerates twentyfour such blemishes and explains them giving definition and illustration. Here follows an account of them.

1. SABDAHINA :

If a word does not satisfy the the principles of grammar, the blemish is Śabdahīna. Since this effects the syntactical relation, this has to be reckoned as a blemish relating to the sentence (Vākyadoṣa). In the instance -

'Na samsmṛumahe hanta hitmāptairnimantritam' [25]

since the root 'sṛ' when it is an Atmanepadi with the preposition 'sam' does not require its object to be mentioned.[26] But here the object 'hitam' has been employed by the poet and since the blemish is based on two words, this has to be reckoned as a blemish related to the sentence.

2. KRAMABHRAṢṬA :

Vidyānātha reproduces verbatim the definition of Bhoja. Kramabhraṣṭa is a blemish where the required order of words or senses is absent. In the illustrative verse it is said that horses or atleast elephants should have been presented to the king Pratāparudra. Here the order should be elephants or at least horses. Hence the blemish here is Kramabhraṣṭa based on sense. Here it is a well-known fact that the tributary kings always try to get the mercy of the emperor by offering valuable presents. As elephants are more valuable than the horses the word elephants should have been employed first and then horses as they are less in value. Such being the case to employ the word horses first and the elephants is violating the order. So this is a case for the blemish Arthakramabhaṅga. In the next verse it is said that Sun and Moon have submerged in the fame and valour of Pratāparudra. It is the general convention to compare the valour with the Sun and fame with the Moon. So in order to keep the order, valour should have been mentioned first and then fame. Though there is propriety regarding sense, the order of the words is faulty. Hence this is a case of the blemish Śabdakramabhraṣṭa.

3. VISANDHI :

The blemish Visandhi occurs in two cases :

i. Where euphonic combination (Sandhi) is not effected though grammar requires it, and

ii. Where euphonic combination though effected is not pleasant to hear.

In the example -

'Sauryāṇi Īdṛśānyāsan pṛthvaiśvaryam kva vā gatam' [27]

the instance *'Sauryāṇi Īdṛśāni'* illustrates the blemish Visandhi due to not effecting the Savarṇadīrghasandhi. "Pṛthvaiśvaryam" is a case where euphonic combination though effected is unpleasant to hear. This also has been verbatim taken from Bhoja.

4. PUNARUKTIMAT :

Punaruktimat is blemish where the sound and its sense are repeated.

'Jīrṇakānana saṅkīrṇe vindhye kānanavṛttayaḥ' [28]

is the example where the word Kānana has been repeated both by sound and sense. If sense differs it ceases to be a blemish and comes to be reckoned as the figure Yamaka. In the context of fear and anxiety it cannot be considered as a blemish.

5. VYĀKĪRṆA :

When there is confusion in mutually construing different words, there the blemish is Vyākīrṇa. In the statement *'Ājñāmurasi bibhrāṇaḥ śirasi kroḍamudrikām'* [29] the words have been irregularly placed. It should be -

'Kroḍamudrikām urasi śirasyājñām bibhrāṇaḥ'.

Hence this irregular placement of the words amounts to the blemish Vyākirṇa. Here Vidyānātha closely follows Bhoja.

6. VĀKYASAṄKĪRṆA :

If the words of one sentence get mixed up with those of another sentence, the blemish is Vakyasankirṇa.

'Mānena mahatasmābhirvane vaktre na tiṣṭhatām I

Vindhyasya jīvitam tanno jātamadya tṛṇam kṛtam' II [30]

is the example where in the words of two sentences have been indiscriminately employed making the sense confusive. Hence the blemish here is Vākyasaṅkīrṇa.

7. APŪRṆA :

Apūrṇa is a blemish where in a statement fails to have connected with a verbal form. In the illustrative verse *'Śaileṣu asmākamāvāsaḥ'* etc.,[31] there is no proper connection between the words 'Paśyan' and 'Asmākam' though it is intended. Instead of 'Sailāvāsam' the poet has said 'Asmākam sailesu āvāsaḥ'. Hence this fails to have syntactical relation with 'Paśyan'. So the blemish here is Apurna. Bhoja does not mention this blemish.

8. VĀKYAGARBHITA :

The blemish Vākyagarbhita occurs where in the middle of a sentence another sentence comes to be mentioned. In the verse "Jñātvāpyandhrapurīndrasya" etc.,[32] we find the statement "Yadva na laṅghyate daivam" has been thrust into the main sentence. So the blemish here is Vākyagarbhita.

9 & 10. BHINNA VACANA & BHINNALIṄGA :

Where the standard of comparison and the object compared are of different gender and number, the blemishes that arise are Bhinnaliṅga

and Bhinnavacana. In the illustration *'Samudra iva'* etc.,[33] the standard of comparison, i.e., Samudra is in plural number. The object compared, i.e., mind is in singular. Hence the blemish is Bhinnavacana. Similarly, in the second half the standard of comparison i.e., Giri is of masculine gender and object compared, i.e., Dhvajanī is feminine. So the blemish here is Bhinnaliṅga.

11 & 12 . ADHIKOPAMĀ AND NYŪNOPAMĀ :

If the attributes spoken in the case of Upamāna are more than those spoken in the case of Upameya the blemish that ensues is Adhikopamā. If reverse is the case the resulting blemish is Nyūnopamā. The illustration given is -

'Kṣāma kṣāma mukhāḥ kāntāḥ kānane mālaveśituḥ I

grīṣme nadyā iva mlānāpadmotpala bisāvilāḥ' II [34]

Here the emaciated faces of the ladies are Upameya and the rivers are Upamāna.. It would be enough if the rivers are qualified by the attribute Mlānapadma. Insteād the poet speaks of another attribute "Mlānotpalabisāvilāḥ" which does not have a corresponding attribute connected with the Upameya. Hence, the blemish here is Adhikopamā.

In the illustration *'Hārāṅgarāga subhaga etc.,'* [35] the attributes given to the Upameya are more than those given to the Upamana. The necklace related to the Upameya has correspondence with the "Nirjhara" spoken as an attribute to the Upamāna. Corresponding to the Aṅgarāga nothing has been said in the section of Upamāna. Hence the blemish here is Nyūnopamā.

13 & 14. BHAGNACCHANDA & YATIBHRAṢṬA :

The concept of these two blemishes are evident from their nomenclature. In the illustration -

'Vindhyāraṇya kṛtakutumba rakṣaṇasya

kim bhadram bhavati janasya mādṛśasya' [36],

there should be Yati after the third letter and that is not observed here. Hence the blemish is Yatibhraṣṭa. The last letter, in accordance with the rules of Prosody, should be a Guru. Instead, we find only Laghu. Hence the blemish here is Bhagnacchanda.

Kumārasvāmin raises a doubt here and answers it himself. According to the rules of Prosody the last letter of the foot of a verse though it is a Laghu can optionally be taken as Guru. Applying this principle here, the last letter "Sya" can be taken as Guru. So this instance fails to illustrate the blemish. Here the answer of Somapīthin is - where there is euphony, there we need not recognise a blemish as in the case of the meters Indravajra and Upendravajra. In the case of meters "Praharṣiṇī", "Vasanta tilaka" etc., this is not the case as the earlier critics feel the absence of euphony there. So this does not cease to be a blemish.

15. AŚARĪRA :

Aśarīra is a blemish where there is no verbal form in a sentence. In the illustration *'Hanta niṣkaruṇo dhātā etc.,* [37] there is no verb to complete the sense. So, the blemish here is Aśarīra.

16. ARĪTIKA :

The composition of words if it is not suggestive of sentiments, the blemish is Arīti. In the example -

'Akharva garva durvāra dorargala nirargalāḥ I

hā bandhuvargāḥ sarvepi kṛtāntatithayaḥ kṛtāh' II [38]

the pathos is the sentiment and the composition is rather bombastic not allowing the sentiment to be clearly suggested. So the blemish here is Arīti.

17. VISARGALUPTA :

Visargalupta is a blemish where 'Visarga' often gets deleted or is replaced by "Ottva". In the verse -

'Vyartho manoratho yāto jāto vāso dhruvo marau I

mlāna dina hatā jirṇā vanānteṣvidṛsāvayam' II [39]

the Visargas are found replaced by 'Ottva', and in the second half they are elided according to the principles "Bho bhago agho apūrvasya yośi" and "lopaśśākalyasya" [40].

18. ASTHĀNASAMĀSA :

Asthānasamāsa is a blemish where a compound is employed in an improper place. In the illustrative verse *'Kutovaimukhyamasmāsu'* etc.,[41] it is said that the enemy kings are angry with the creator for placing them in a miserable condition. Here the compound may be used for their anger. Instead the poet employs it in the description of the faces of the kings. Hence the compound is out of place and as such this amounts to the blemish Asthānasamāsa.

19. VĀCYAVARJITA :

Vācyavarjita is a blemish where the thing that ought to have been said has not been said. In the example -

'Durdaśām pratipannānāmasmākam jivitam matam' etc. [42]

the word "Api" has not been employed. Hence it is a case of Vācyavarjita.

20 & 21. SAMĀTTAPUNARĀTTAKAM & PATATPRAKARṢA :

Even after the completion of a sentence if something related to it has been said, the blemish is Samāttapunarāttaka. Patatprakarṣa is the blemish where the orderliness in view of greatness etc., has been

over-looked. These two defects are illustrated in a single verse -

'Dhāvanmṛgeṣu sambhrāmyatkariṣūdyattarakṣusu I

Vindhyāraṇyeṣu tiṣṭhāmaḥ kṣubhyadbhallūkapaṅktiṣu' II [43]

Though the sentence is completed with the word "tiṣṭāmaḥ" the poet again brings in "Kṣubhyadbhallūka paṅktiṣu" as an attribute to the word Vindhyāraṇya. Hence the blemish is Samāttapunarāttaka here. While mentioning the animals in the forest the relative greatness has not been kept in view. To be correct, the order should be *Sambhrmyātkariṣu udyattarakṣu dhāvan mṛgeṣu.* But this order has been violated and so the blemish here is Patatprakarsa.

22. SAMBHNDHAVARJITA :

The blemish Sambandhavarjita comes into picture where a word fails to be construe with another when such construel is desirable. In the illustration *'Bhadrāsanāni dṛsadahchhatrāṇi mahīruhaḥ'* etc.,[44] the intention of the poet is that in the kingdom of the forest the stones are the thrones. This, however, is not clearly mentioned in view of the fact that the word Rajya happens to be the member of a compound.

23. ADHIKAPADA :

Adhikapda is the blemish where unnecessary words are employed. In the instance *'Vimukta vallabhaireta* etc.,[45] it would have been sufficient to say Sudhāmśu pāṇḍuraḥ'. The poet, however, adds unnecessary wording *'Maṇḍalākāra rūpakrama'*. Hence the blemish here is Adhikapada.

24. BHAGNAPRAKRAMA :

Bhaganaprakrama is violating the order which has been taken up first. In the illustrative verse the words 'Guha' and 'Gṛham' are employed in plural number and *'Vindhyabhūḥ purī'* [46] is employed in

singular. Hence it is a case of Bhagnaprakrama.

ARTHADOṢAS

The blemishes relating to the sense are enumerated as eighteen by Vidyānātha.

1. APĀRTHA :

Apārtha is a blemish where we do not find cogent sense running through a verse. In the illustration - *'Kutaḥ suṣyadapanadyaḥ'* etc.,[47] we do not find a connected sense being propounded by the four lines of the verse. Hence the blemish is Apārtha. Same is the concept given in the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja [48] whom Vidyānātha closely follows.

2. VYARTHA :

Vyartha is the blemish where the sense presented does not serve any purpose. In the verse *'Nirmalaṁ kulamudvelam'* etc[49]., the factors that are mentioned serve no purpose as they cannot form the cause for serving the king Pratāparudra. Hence the blemish here is 'Vyartha'.

3. EKĀRTHA :

Ekārtha is the blemish where the sense presented is no way different from what has already been said. In the illustrative verse *'Viśīrṇaṁ śatathā cetaḥ'* etc., [50] the sense presented in the first line differs in no way from the sense presented in the second line. Hence the blemish here is Ekārtha.

4. SASAMŚAYA :

Sasamśaya is a blemish where there is doubt regarding the sense sought to be presented.

'Karikumbhau stanāvadya jayataṁ kṣāmatām gatau I

latā vapuśśriyaḥ strīṇām hasantu mlānatam gataḥ' II [51]

In the above verse there is the doubt regarding the object and the subject. Hence the blemish here is Sasamśaya.

5. APAKRAMA :

Apakrama is a blemish where there is violation of the order of the preceding and the succeeding ones. In the illustrative verse "Hanta *vyadāya'* etc.,[52] it is said that the ladies have opened their mouths and slept which is far from our experience for, the act of opening the mouth takes place after sleep. According to the aphorism *'Samāna kartṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle'* [53], the suffix "Ktva" is adjoined to the root whose sense is first known to have been performed by the agent. In the statements like *'Mukham vyadaya svapiti'* the opening of the mouth is only after the sleep has begun. Then how is it the suffix "Ktva" has been adjoined here for the root ' Da'. To this, the answer is - even after the opening of the mouth the sleep continues and with reference to this slèep there is precedence for act of opening. Hence the suffix "Ktva" is adjoined to the root 'Da'. If such an explanation held correct, then the view of Vidyānātha that it is a wrong usage becomes untenable. Here Somapīthin adds that even before the opening of the mouth, there is the activity of sleeping. With reference to this prior stage of sleep the root 'Da' ought not to have got the suffix "Ktva". So the expression can be taken as an instance where the order of the preceding and the succeeding ones has been violated.

6. BHINNA :

Bhinna is a blemish where there is no relevance between the statements made. In the verse -

'Nūnam phaleṣu latānāṁ' [54]etc., of the two statements viz., "the creator did not write anything on the foreheads of the people belonging to Lāṭa country" and "our families are suffering in the

deserts" one has nothing to do with the other. Hence, the blemish here is Bhinna.Bhoja mentions Khinna as one of the blemishes and defines it as -

'Jatyādyuktavanirvyūḍham khinnamāhur mahādhiyaḥ' [55]

According to him the characteristics of a particular species taken up for description should be carried till the end. If the poet fails to observe such characteristics, then the blemish is Khinna.

Dr. Raghavan while observing that Vidyānātha made some changes makes the following remark :

'Bhoja' Khinna is given as Bhinna and also conceived differently from Bhoja's Khinna' [56]

This statement of his is ambiguous since if Bhinna is conceived differently from Khinna, how can one say that Khinna of Bhoja is given as Bhinna of Vidyānātha ? Both can be treated as independent blemishes, one having no bearing on the other. According to Bhoja, if anything is stated not in confirmity with one's species, the blemish that arises is Khinna. In the world too, it is said that one is Khinna or dejected if one is not able to carry out the work he has taken up. Here too, on the same analogy, while describing the characteristics of a particular species, the poet should not introduce an element which is heterogeneous to the above said species. Comparing the two concepts of Bhinna and Khinna of Vidyānātha and Bhoja one may find that while the former speaks of irrelevance in general, the latter speaks of a deviation from the general characteristics of a species. Hence, it would be better to treat these two separately as there is a clear difference in their concepts.

7. ATIMATRA :

Atimātra is the blemish where the narration of a poet transends the human experience. In the illustration *'Mābhudekārṇavam'* etc., [57] it is said that the ladies of the Lāṭa country have created so many rivers by

their tears lest there should be a single ocean in the world. Here the statement that theyhave created so many rivers with their tears goes beyond even one's imagination. Hence the blemish here is Atimātra. However, this cannot be taken as a case of the figure Atiśayokti, for, charm, the *sine-qua-non* of a figure, is absent here.

8. PARUṢA :

Paruṣa is a blemish where a very cruel act is expressed. In the illustration *'Dāvānalendhanam saḍyaḥ'* etc.,[58] it is said that the children who are begging for fruits are ordered to be consigned to wild-fire. Hence the blemish is Paruṣa.

9. VIRASA :

Virasa is a blemish where the depiction of a sentiment which is irrelevant to the context. In the illustration it is said that the barbarians of the forest are teasing the Cola women with amarous overtures.[59] The contextual sentiment is Pathos. The erotic sentiment described here is antogonistic to the contextual sentiment and hence this amounts to the blemish Virasa. This blemish arises due to impropriety. *'Anaucitya dṛtenānyadrasabhangasya kāraṇam'.*

10. HĪNOPAMA :

Hīnopama is a blemish where the standard of comparison is inferior to the object compared. Here, Kumārasvāmin rightly observes that this inferiority is of two kinds based on species or size. However, Vidyānātha illustrates the first variety with the verse *'Śunakairiva'* etc.[60] Here the object of comparison is the king and the standard of comparison is dogs. Hence, the blemish here is Hīnopama.

11. ADHIKOPAMA :

Adhikiopma is a blemish where the standard of comparison is far superior to the object compared. In the illustration the standard of comparison is great sages and the object compared is cranes.[61] This

is an instance where the superiority is based on species. Similar illustration can be shown even in the case where the superiority is based on size. Kumārasvāmin in his commentary gives the following verse to illustrate this variety

'Pāṭalamivanābhiste parvatā iva te stanau I

Veṇīdaṇḍapunarayam kālindī padasannibhaḥ' II

In both the cases impropriety is the common basis of the blemish.

12. ASADṚŚOPAMA :

Asadṛśopama is a blemish where there is no similarity between the standard of comparison and the object. compared. In the illustrative verse the Vindhya mountain with its flowing streams is compared to Lord Śiva with his third eye sending forth the flames of fire[62]. Here there is no trace of similarity between the two and hence the blemish here is Asadṛśopama. Explaining the situation, Kumārasvāmin in his commentary observes that there is no well-known similarity either between the mountain and Lord Śiva or between their attributes. It cannot be said here that sometimes through Dharmin (object) the similarity of Dharmas (attribute) can be spoken of. For, in such a case there is the defect of mutual dependence. Vāmana while commenting on the statement -

'Badhnāmi kāvyaśaśinām vitatārtha rasmim', observes -

'Tadevam itaretarasrya dosoduruttarah'.

Here too, the position being the same, the blemish is to be accepted as being present.

13. APRASIDDHOPAMA :

Aprasiddhopama is the blemish where the standard of comparison is not well-known in the poetic world. In the illustration *'Bāṣpāmbu klinna netrāṇi'* etc.,[63] the faces are compared to the lilies. No where

in the writings of poets, we find lily being taken up as a standard of comparison for face. Hence this amounts to the blemish Aparasiddhopama.

14. HETUSŪNYA :

Hetusūnya is a blemish where the statement made has no reason to support it. In the illustation "Budhānudhāvanam" etc.,[64] the statement that "this is not the path of the lady" lacks reason and hence stands unsupported. So the blemish here is Hetusūnya.

15. NIRALAṄKṚTI :

Niralaṅkṛti is a blemish where a poetic passage has no figure of speech to embellish it. In the illustration the statement - "Aghrāya surabheryonim" etc.,[65] there is no figure to make the sense charming. The description as it is vulgar and hence fails to please the critics. This is neither a case of Svabhāvokti.

16. AŚLĪLA :

Aślīla is a blemish where inauspicious, bashful and disgustful things are described. The above verse serves as an example for this type also. Earlier, a blemish having the same name is mentioned in connection with the blemishes based on sound. The difference is this: In the former case the words are irreplaceable by their synonyms while in the case of blemishes of sense it is possible. So this blemish has to be noted as based on sense.

17. VIRUDDHA :

Viruddha is the blemish where a statement goes against the time and place. In the illustration *'Diśyuttarasyām'* etc.,[66] it is said that there is ocean to the North of the country and the Ganges is in desert. Hence the blemish here is Viruddha.

18. SAHACARABHRAṢṬA :

Sahacarabhrasta is a blemish where the combination of unequal things is presented. In the illustration *Śāntya Śrutam hriyā nāri* etc.,[67] sacred things like Śruta have been coupled with women and dalliance which amounts to this blemish.

Thus Vidyānātha defines and illustrates several poetic blemishes and asks the reader to detect others also on these lines. He concludes this chapter observing that sentiments and moods etc., should not be expressed by their own terms.. This fact has been sufficiently emphasised by Ānandavardhana in his Dhvanyāloka.

CHAPTER - VI

GUṆA PRAKARANA

Regarding excellences there are three prominent schools. The first school speaks of ten excellences while the second one speaks of only three and the third one mentions excellences as twenty four. Vāmana while following Bharata in the enumeration of excellences adds a new point that these are essentially based on both sound and sense. Thus according to him, the ten excellences Śleṣa etc., become twenty in view of their two bases sound and sense. Bhāmaha, Ānadavardhana and Mammaṭa represent the second school. The third school, however, which speaks of twenty four excellences is represented by Bhoja and Vidyānātha. While Bhoja takes all the twenty four as a group, Vidyānātha distinguishes and divides them under two groups. The excellences coming under the first group are of the form of absence of blemishes. The second group, however, contains such excellences, that positively contribute to the beauty of Poetry.

Bhoja, following Vāmana observes that the twenty four excellences he speaks of, may be based on sound and sense. Thus, according to him, although the names of excellences based on sound are the same as those based on sense, their concept is different. Vidyānātha, however, ignores the fact of excellences being based on sound and sense and appears to consider them as exclusively based on sound only. In his introductory note, he brings home this fact very clearly. However, he uniformly illustrares all of them.

1. ŚLEṢA :

Śleṣa is an excellence where many words are so coalsced as to appear as a single word. This is seen illustrated in the verse "Śrīmat kākati vīrarudra" etc.[1]. Bharata defines Śleṣa twice. The verses ninetyseven and nintyeight of the Seventeenth Chapter of the Nāṭyaśāstra deal with this excellence. In the ninetyseventh verse

'Śliṣṭa' is the term used, while in the ninetyeighth the term used is Śleṣa. In the latter verse he observes that the employment of words should be very conducive for the presentation of the desired sense. One does not find the distinction of Śleṣa as based on sound and sense. Still, one is tempted to believe that the latter definition paved way for the excellence based on sense. Daṇḍin opines that there should be prevalence of letters of Alpaprāṇa type.[2] Jagannātha adds that the letters employed should be of a particular species (Ekajātiyānām).[3]

2. PRASĀDA :

Prasāda is an excellence where words are employed in their well established sense. The verse *'Pratāparudradevo'yam bhāti'* etc.,[4] illustrates this excellence. Here the sense is immediately known. Almost all the other writers have the same concept.[5] Jagannātha, however, adds that the words used should be commensurate to the sense they present.[6] Bharata opines that Prasāda is the excellence where on account of the clarity of sound and sense ideas unexpressed too are conveyed.[7]

3. SAMATĀ :

Samatā is an excellence where there is uniformity throughout the verse. The verse *'Vadānyatarumañjarī surabhayaḥ'* etc.[8], stands as an illustration for this excellence since all the four feet are uniformly dealt with in view of sound and sense. Daṇḍin, however, speaks of three varieties of this excellence as Mṛdu, sphuṭa, and Madhyama, according to the nature of the words employed.[9]

4. MĀDHURYA :

Mādhurya is an excellence where there are separate words without compounds. In the verse *'Yaśaḥ śriyaḥ kākatibhūpaterdiśām'* etc.,[10] all the words are separately placed. Bhoja opines that this excellence can be found even in the instances of anger when it is not vehement.[11]

5. SAUKUMĀRYA :

Saukumārya is an excellence where the combination of words having delicate letters as *'Amandānandaniṣy-andasundarīvadanendubhiḥ'* etc. [12]. The delicacy of letters is to be explained as the combination of soft sounds in combination with nasals.

6. ARTHAVYAKTI :

Arthavyakti is an excellence where the sentences employed are so complete that there cannot be any kind of expectency (Ākāṅkṣā). The verse *'Bhāgyam madhyamaloka nighnmadhunā'* etc., [13] illustrates this excellence. It is advised that words which are not in common parlance, forced diction and circuitous expressions may be avoided in this context. [14]

7. KĀNTI :

Kānti is an excellence where the composition of words is very bright. The verse *'Jetuḥ Kākati vīrarudranṛpateḥ'* etc.,[15] is the illustration given.

Kumārasvāmisomapīthin adds that without this excellence the composition becomes uninteresting as the one in the Purāṇas. Bharata explains it as the structure of delight that stirs the heart of the connoisseur.[16]

8. AUDĀRYA :

Audārya is an excellence which comprises of uneven letters. "Jagdhvābhūyāṁsi māmsānyahamahamikayā" etc.[17] is the illustration shown. Jagannātha defines this excellence in the form of the gravity caused by the use of hard consonants [18] where as Vāmana considers it as the oscillating flow of words (Vikatata) [19].

9. UDĀTTATĀ :

Udātta is that which comprises of laudable adjectives.

'Brmhamānagajākirṇa' etc.,[20] is the verse given for illustration. According to Bhoja the loftiness of the ideal is Udāttatā.[21] But Bharata considers it as having more than one sense with charming structure (Sauṣṭhava).[22]

10. OJAS :

Ojas is an excellence where compounds in abundance are used. *'Uddāmadviradaughadānalaharī'* etc.,[23] is the verse given for illustration. Jagannātha defines this excellence as follows : *'Samyogapara hrasvaprācurya rūpam gāḍhatva mojaḥ'* .[24] "Ojas is an excellence where the profuse use of short syllables followed by the conjoint consonants".

11. SUŚABDATĀ :

Suśabdatā is the usage of words with a good derivative meaning. The verse for illustration is *'Aśāmaṇḍalākulā mudvāhakathaiḥ'* etc.[25]

12. PREYAS :

Preyas is an excellence where most pleasing ideas are expressed. *'Dākṣinyam tvayi dakṣatā tvayi'* etc.,[26] is the illustration.

13. AURJITYA :

Aurjitya is an excellence where the composition is very closely knit. The verse - *'Kṣoṇīrakṣaṇadakṣiṇaḥ'* etc.,[27] is the illustration.

14. SAMĀDHI :

Samādhi is the super imposition of qualities of an object on another. *'Prcchanti dugdhasindhum'* etc.,[28] is the verse given as an illustration. Jagannātha presents it as the composition of compactness altering with the loose ones .[29] Daṇḍin presents this as the super-imposition of the attributes of one upon the other,[30] while Jayadeva considers as the charming expression that stirs the mind of the connoisseur with beatitude.[31]

15. VISTĀRA :

Vistara is an excellence where a statement made is supported by many facts. *'Lokeṣu triṣu Kākatīśvaraguṇān'* [32] is the verse for illustration.

16. SAMMITATTVA :

'Sammitattava' is an excellence where the words are commensurate to the sense expressed.

'Kākatīyanarendrasyakīrticandanacarcanam' etc., [33] is the verse for illustration.

17. GĀMBHĪRYA :

Gambhīra is an excellence where there is some suggestivity. The verse *'Viṣamkaukṣeyakegaṅgā'* etc., [34] is the illustration. Here it is suggested that lord Śaṅkara holds poison in throat, and the Ganges and the moon on the head.

18. SAṄKṢEPA :

Saṅkṣepa is the excellence where the ideas are briefly presented. *'Vamsostikākatiyānām'* etc. [35] is the verse given for illustration.

19. SAUKṢMYA :

Saukṣmya is the excellence where the intended meaning is concealed. The example is *'Adhyadhaḥ parisamśliṣṭhaḥ'* etc. [36] Here the sense of the words Adhitiṣṭhati, Adhaḥkaroti and Paribhavati is presented in a concealed manner.

20. PRAUḌHI :

Prauḍhi is an excellence where there is maturity of expression. In the verse *'Vipsāpadmabhavasya Candramukuṭā'* etc., [37] it is illustrated.

21. UKTI :

Ukti is an excellence where the expression has been dextrously

presented. *'Dṛṣṭā Kamalāsakti rajñastava'* etc., [38] is the illustration.

22. RĪTI :

Rīti is an excellence where the feature in the beginning is maintained throughout. *'Sadguṇānsevate rāja'* etc [39] is the verse that stands for illustration.

23. BHĀVIKA :

Bhāvika is an excellence where there is an expression out of fullness of feeling. *'Svāmimstātakulottaṁsa'* etc. [40] is the verse for illustration.

24. GATI :

Gati is an excellence where there is beauty on account of ascendency and descendency of vowels. Where the vowels are in a lengthened form there is ascendency. If they are short there is descendency. *'Prakāśye trailokye'*etc.,[41] is the illustration.Many of the Ālaṅkārikas with the exception of scholars like Vāmana hold that these excellences like Ojas, Prasāda etc., pertain to the sense. [42] But according to the Ālaṅkārikas like Udbhaṭa, these excellences are said to have the entire composition as their substratum. That is why it is said in the Alaṅkārasarvasva, that Guṇas are the properties of both sound and sense while Alaṅkāras are the external embellishments of Poetry.[43] In this way the distinction between the Guṇas and Alaṅkāras has been made. If the substratum is discarded there ceases to be any distinction between Guṇas and Alaṅkāras, as the function of Guṇas and Alaṅkāras is only to beautify poetry.

CHAPTER - VII

ŚABDĀLAṄKĀRA PRAKARAṆA

Now as the excellences are already dealt with, Alaṅkāras are to be explained. Vidyānātha gives the derivation of the word 'Alaṅkāra' as *'Alaṅkriyate aneneti cārutvaheturalaṅkāraḥ'* [1]. The cause of poetic beauty i.e. the factors that beautify poetry are desginated as Alaṅkāra. Writers like Vāmana and Mammaṭa have the same derivation to give for the word Alaṅkāra[2].

The limbs of the body of poetry - sound and sense - are adorned by figures like Anuprāsa and Upamā. In the world, one finds ornaments embellishing the organs of a human body. Similar is the case with poetry too, where figures act as embellishing factors. According to Vidyānātha the division of figures as belonging to sound and sense is based on Aśrayāśrayībhāva. Though both excellences and figures of poetry are beautifying factors, the distinction between them is to be known by their substratum only. Vidyānātha, in the Kāvyaprakaraṇa mentions the excellences Śleṣa etc., as the attributes of the soul of poetry. Figures of speech, however, go to embellish sound and sense. The two statements - one referring to the excellences as the attributes of the composition and another as the attributes of the soul of poetry involve no self contradiction. According to Mammaṭa, excellences primarily residing in sentiments are also hold to be attributes of composition in a secondary way. Hence, the statements like *'Madhurā racanā', 'ojasvi bandhaḥ'* have to be taken as usages involving secondary function i.e., Lakṣaṇā.

According to Vidyānātha figures are of three types as those based on sound, sense and both. Again, they can be classified under four heads on a different basis. In some figures an idea is suggested while in others similarity is suggested. In the third case sentiments, moods etc., are suggested. In the last the suggested idea is not clear.

In the figures Samāsokti, Paryāyokti, Ākṣepa, Parikara, Vyājastuti, Upameyopama, Ananvaya, Atiśayokti, Aprastutapraśaṁsa, Anuktanimitta Viśeṣokti - the Vastu is suggested, where as in Rūpaka, Pariṇāma, Sandeha, Bhrāntimat, Ullekha, Apahnava, Utprekṣā, Smaraṇa, Tulyayogita,Dīpl'aka, Prativastūpamā, Dṛṣṭānta, Sahokti, Vyatireka, Nidarśana, Śleṣa - the Aupamya itself is the beautifying factor of the poetry (Kavyopaskāra). In the figures like Rasavat, Preyas, Ūrjasvin, Samāhita, Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi, and Bhāvaśabalatā, there is the suggestion of sentiments and moods. In the figures Upamā, Vinokti, Arthāntaranyāsa, Virodha, Vibhāvana, Atadguṇa, Nimitta, Viśeṣokti, Viṣama, Sama, Citra, Adhika, Anyonya, Kāraṇamālā, Ekāvalī, Vyāghāta, Mālādīpaka, Kāvyaliṅga, Anumāna, Sāra, Yathāsaṅkhya, Arthāpatti, Parisaṁkhya, Vikalpa, Samuccaya, Samādhi, Pratyanīka, Pratīpa, Viśeṣa, Nimīlana, Sāmānya, Asangati, Tadguṇa, Atadguṇa, Vyajokti, Vakrokti, Svabhāvokti, Bhāvika and Udātta there is no suggested iḍea presented clearly that can please the connoisseur.

Figures could be classified under groups basing on Sādharmya, Virodha etc. The figure Sādharmya is again of three types as

1. One which has the difference as the main element,
2. One which has the non-difference as the main element, and
3. One which has got both the difference and nondifference as their chief elements.

The similarity that has been mentioned between Upamāna and Upameya is purely verbal and not factual.

Rūpaka,Pariṇama,Sandeha, Bhrāntimat, Ullekha, Apahnava are the figures that have identity (Abheda) as their principal characteristic and as such they belong to one group.

The Alaṅkāras - Dīpaka, Tulyayogita, Nidarśana, Dṛṣṭānta, Prativastūpamā, Sahokti, Pratīpa and Vyatireka have the difference as their chief feature and hence these belong to the second group.

Upamā, Ananvaya, Upameyopamā, Smaraṇa have the common characteristic of Bhedābheda and so they come under the third group.

Utprekṣā and Atiśayokti have their base in Adhyavasāya and as such these two make a separate group. Vibhāvanā, Viśeṣokti, Viṣama, Citra, Asangati, Anyonya, Vyāghata, Atadguṇa and Viśeṣa, as they have conflict as the common basis come under separate group.

The figures Yathāsaṅkhya, Parisaṅkhya, Arthāpatti, Vikalpa and Samuccaya are based on Vākyanyāya. Therefore these form a sixth group.

Some figures have the world convention as their base. They are Parivṛtti, Pratyanīka, Tadguṇa, Samādhi, Sama, Bhāvika, Svabhāvokti, Udātta and Vinokti, and as such they are classified as figures based on world convention and hence they come under the seventh group,

Kāvyaliṅga, Anumāna and Arthāntaranyāsālaṅkāras are logic oriented and hence they make another group - the eighth.

Kāraṇamālā, Ekāvalī, Mālādīpaka and Sāra have the charm of forming into a chain and as such they comprise the ninth group.

The Alaṅkāras Vyājokti, Vakrokti and Mīlana have concealment as their basis and so they come under tenth.

The figures Samāsokti and parikara have the charm based on attributes as common factor. So they come under a different group, the eleventh.

Thus all the figures by virtue of their common features have been divided into eleven groups. Each group have some figures to its credit. Now the question may arise how these figures of the same group differ from the another though they have the same common factor. As an answer for this, some seventeen rules have been postulated that help us to discriminate the figures coming under the same group.

The two Alaṅkāras that is Pariṇāma and Rūpaka, though they have Āropa as their basis, differ from each other. In the figure Pariṇāma the object super-imposed serves, the contextual purpose. In Rūpaka, however, it is not the case. In Ullekaha the form of the object super-imposed has relevance while in Rūpaka it is absent. When the object of superimposition is doubled the figure is Sandeha. If there is delusion in its apprehension, the figure is Bhrāntimat. If it is concealed the figure is Apahnava. So these three fctors with respect to the object of super-imposition are responsible for the above said three figures.

Though the figures Tulyayogitā, Dīpaka, Nidarśana, Vyatireka and Dṛṣṭānta have similarity as the common basis, the similarity in the figures Upamā, Ananvaya, and Upameyopamā is expressed while in the former it is suggested. Hence the difference. In Upameyopamā similarity is expressed while in Prativastūpamā it is suggested. So they differ. In prativastūpamā there is Vastuprativastubhāva while in Dṛṣṭānta Bimbapratibimbabhāva is present. In Tulyayogitā, the contextual and the non-contextual are dealt with separately, while in Dīpaka they are clubbed together. This makes the difference.

In the figure Upamā, the standard of comparision is well known, while in Utprekṣā it is not so. Hence the difference. The difference between Upamā and Śleṣa is that, while in Upamā there is similarity based on sense; in Śleṣa it is based on sound (word). In the figure Upamā, Upamāna and Upameya are distinctly different while in Ananvaya the same subject is chosen as both Upamāna and Upameya. The distinction between Upameyopamā and Upamā is this. In Upameyopamā the similarity is expressed in turn while in Upamā it is simultaneous. If the non-contextual, sense is expressed the figure is Aprastutapraśaṁsa. If it is suggested, it is a case of Samāsokti. In the figure paryayokti both expressed and suggested senses are contextual. If the expressed sense is non-contextual, the figure is Aprastutapraśaṁsa. In the figure Anumāna, we find the factors Vyāpti, Pakṣadharmatā etc., while in Kāvyaliṅga they are absent. On account

of striking similarity if the distinciton between two objects cannot be known, the figure is Sāmānya. Mīlana occurs where an object of superior quality eclipses the one of inferior quality. Parisaṅkhyā and Udatta have this feature of distnciton. Where there is no intention of discriminating one object from the other, there the figure is Udātta. If such intention is there, it is Parisaṅkhyā.

If incidentlally another cause helps to expedite the production of an effect, the figure is Samādhi. If many causes enthusiastically come forward to complete an action, the second variety of Samuccaya is the figure.

Concealment whe expressed, the figure is Apahnava, when suggested it is Vyājastuti. As regards other figures the distinction is clear and needs no mention.Though there is a faint similarity in Vyājokti, Mīlana and Sāmānya, as it is not considered to be conveyed, they are not inlcuded in figures based on similarity.

Out of the two constituents of the word Souund and sense, it is the sound that first attracts our attetion and as such, Vidyānātha first takes up the Śabdālaṅkāras with illustrations.

1. CHEKĀNUPRĀSA :

The repetition of the couplets of consonants without interval is called Chekanuprasa. In the illustrative verse[3] the repetition of the words 'Mahi', 'Kare', and 'Janya' make out a case for chekānuprāsa. Kumārasvāmin explains the term 'cheka' following the author of the Alaṅkārasarvasva. Anuprāsa means the skilled employment of letters that are conducive to sentiments and those who are aware of the sweetness of the words are known as Chekas (scholars).

2. VṚTTYANUPRĀSA :

When there is repetition of consonants only, once, twice, or thrice, it is a case of Vṛttyanuprāsa. This is, however, different from

Chekānuprāsa as there is no restriction that couplets of consonants should be repeated without interval. Here, by the word 'Vṛtti' the styles Vaidarbhī etc., are intended to be taken. As this figure has the characteristics of those styles it is designated as such. In the verse given as an illustration[4] the consonant 'Kṣa' occurs fourteen times, and thus it is a case of Vṛttyanuprāsa.

3. YAMAKA :

The recurrence of consonants with the vowels is designated as Yamaka. In Cheka and Vṛtti the recurrence of vowels is simply accidental. This could be of various types like Adiyamaka, Madhyayamaka and Antyayamaka etc. In the illustrative verse[5] the word 'Mahāmahimatejasaḥ' occurs at the end of first and second foot. So the example may be considered as an illustration of Antyayamaka.

This is a figure where there is an apparent congition of the sense being repeated. Udbhaṭa is said to be the first author for treating this as an Alaṅkāra. There is a controversy whether this figure is to be designated as Śabdālaṅkāra or Arthālaṅkāra. Udbhaṭa considers it as Śabdālaṅkāra[6] while Ruyyaka opines it as an Arthālaṅkāra[7]. Mammaṭa, on the otherhand, considers it as Ubhayālaṅkāra[8]. However, Vidyānātha resorts to the view of Udbhaṭa in considering this as Śabdālaṅkāra.

5. LĀṬĀNUPRĀSA :

If there is repetition of sound and sense with a difference in the intention, it is a case of Lāṭānuprāsa. In Punaruktavadābhāsa there is an illusion of redundance of sound. Here, however, the illusion of redundance of both sound and sense is present.

'Guṇāguṇāste gaṇyante ye rudranṛpamāśritāḥ I
Nītirnītirasau tasya lakṣmīlakṣmīśca Kathyate'[9] *II*

This verse illustrates this figure. Here the words 'guṇa' 'Nīti',

'Lakṣmī' have been repated. The second member in the repetition stands for qualities of a superior type. Thus, as there is the differnce of purport, it is a case of Lāṭānuprāsa. Kumārasvāmin says that this is also of two types based on stem (prātipadika) and word (pada). As such, where there is difference of Vibhakti in cases like *'Abjapatranayane! Nayanānimilya'*, Lāṭānuprāsa is acceptable. Here a doubt may arise:

In the illustration given for Ananvayalankara - *'Rāmarāvaṇayoryuddham Rāmarāvaṇayoriva'*, the definition given for Lāṭānuprāsa may apply as there is redundance of both sound and sense. This doubt, however, can be cleared thus: In Ananvayālaṅkāra the main stress is on the redundance of sense, rather than of sound. Still, in order to avoid the defect "Apakrama" the sound is also repated. This, however, is not compulsory. Hence, in Ananvaya, the redundance of sense is essnential where in Lāṭa the redundance of both sound and sense is important. So there is no over lapping of one figure on the other.

Ananvayeca śabdaikyamaucityādānuṣaṅgikam I
Asmimstu lāṭānuprāse sākṣādeva prayojakam [10] *II*

CITRĀLAṄKĀRAS

When the letters of a particular verse can be arranged in such a way that they form into designs like Lotus, wheel etc., it is called Citrālaṅkāra. Here Kumārasvāmin, adds that though letters are of form of sound, being perceived only by the ear, how is it possible to say that they form into different shapes like lotus etc. The answer given is that though letters are of the form of sound they bring to our mind the forms of different designs like lotus. Such letters only are meant here. Vidyānātha illustrates different types of designs lotus, wheel and serpent. In this connection Kumārasvāmin quotes verses that describe the details related to different designs.

CHAPTER - VIII

ARTHĀLAṄKĀRAPRAKARAṆA

1. UPAMĀ :

After the discussion of the figures that are based on sound, the figures based on sense are to be explained. Upamālaṅkāra enjoys prominence on account of its being the basis of many figures. Kumārasvāmin observes that in some cases the similarity is expressed as in the case of figures like Pratīpa. In other cases it is suggested as in the case of figures like Rūpaka.

Vidyānātha explains that the Upamāna should be something present in the world. The comparison between Upamāna and Upameya should be charming and is generally based on either Guṇa or Kriyā. Vidyānātha reads the definition as follows:

Svatassiddhena bhinnena sammatena ca dharmataḥ I

Sāmyamanyenavarṇasya vācyamcedekadopamā [1] *II*

In this definition all the clauses (dalas) are apt. Here the main idea is the comparison of the contextual (Prakṛta) with the non-contextual (Aprakṛta). The remaining clauses defend the definition from the blemishes of over pervasion, less pervasion and non-applicability. Here, the significance of each clause in the definition is examined. The first clause is - "Svatassiddha'. By the employment of this clause the figure Utprekṣa is eliminated. If this clause is not employed, the definition given for Upamā becomes applicable to Utprakṣa also.

'Kīrtiḥkākativīrarudranṛpatessimhāsanādhyāsinaḥ

Prācām bhūmibhujāmyaśaḥ pidadhati koṭīndutulyadyutiḥ I

Rakṣādakṣiṇarājalābhajanitānandāpramodotthitā

Trailokyaṭṭahāsaprabheva kakubhām prānteṣu vidyotate [2] II

Here, the fame of Pratāparudra is the Upameya and is contextual (Prastuta). As it has been fancied as the laughter of the three worlds it could have been a case for Simile. So, the clause 'svatassidhena' has to be employed in the definition. Here the laughter of the three worlds is something fancied by the poet and is not present in the world.

The second clause "bhinnena" excludes the figure Ananvaya from the purview of the definition.

'Santu loke suvarṇadriratnākarasudhākarāḥ I

Tathāpi vīrarudroyam vīrarudra iva svayam' [3] II

This is an example for Ananvaya only as Upamāna and Upameya happen to be the same. By the word "Sammatena" there is exclusion of defective comparisions. Vidyānātha illustrates how a pleasing similarity can be. The verse *'Udanvāniva'* etc., presents comparison of a delectable type.The fourth clause 'Dharmataḥ' excludes the figure Śleṣa.

'nirājayantyandhrapuriramaṇyaḥ pradīpajālairvaravīrarudramI

Candrānanā gotrapatim rajanyastarāganairmerumiva sphuradbhiḥ' [4] II

Here, it is said that the ladies of the city are giving Nirājana to Pratāparudra with the help of big lights as nights offer the same to the mountain 'Meru' with groups of stars. The word 'gotra' has two senses to convey, one dynasty and the other mountain. The compound 'Candrānanā'can be split in two ways. *1. Candra iva ānanam yāsāntāḥ'* and *2. Candra eva ānanam yāsāntāḥ'.* Here, there is verbal similarity and not the one based on quality or action. Hence it is a case of Śleṣa.

By the fifth clause 'anyena varṇyasya sāmyam' the figure Pratīpa is excluded. In the illustrative verse the mountain 'Meru' which is non contextual has been compared with Pratāparudra who is contextual and as such, it is a case of the figure pratīpa and not of Upamā. If this fifth clause is not employed, the above verse would have been treated as s case of Upamā. To avoid such a contingency, Vidyānātha employed this clause and avoided the defect of overpervasion for the definition.

The sixth clause 'Ekadāsamya' helps in avoiding the figure Upameyopamā.

'Dharmo'rtha iva pūrṇaśrīrarthe dharma iva sthitaḥ I

Kāmastāviva tau kāma iva rudranareśvare' [5] *II*

This is an example for the figure 'Upameyopamā' as there is comparison mentioned more than once in the case of Dharma, Artha and Kāma. If this clause is not included in the definition, it would have been not possible to exclude the figure 'Upameyopamā'.

The last and the seventh clause employed is 'Vācya' which means that the similarity should be expressed. The figures Rūpaka, Sandeha, Bhrāntimat, Ullekha, Apahnava, Tulyayogitā, Dīpaka, Prativastūpamā, Dṛṣṭānta, Sahokti, Vyatireka and Nidarśana have suggested similarity. So they are excluded from the purview of this definition. The author then takes up verses that illustrate the figures Rūpaka, Sandeha, Bharāntimat, Ullekha and Apahnava and shows how the employment of this clause restricts such figures getting into the fold of the definition of the figure 'Upamā'.

Broadly speaking, the figure 'Upamā' is of two types namely 'Pūrṇopamā' and 'Luptopamā'. 'Pūrṇopamā' has four constituents, 'Upamāna', 'Upameya', Sādhāraṇadharma and Sādṛśyavācaka.

The absence of any one, two or three of the above four constitutents is designated as Luptopamā. Pūrṇopamā is again of two types Śrautī and Ārthī. The usage of words that suggest the comparison like Yathā, Iva etc., makes for Śrautī. Ārthi, however, occurs where there is the employment of words that indirectly convey similarity like Sadṛśa, Saṅkāśa, Nīkāśa and Pratīkāśa. Again, Pūrṇopamā is of six types as the above mentioned two types become six basing on the factors sentence, compound and the suffix Taddhita.

Luptopamā is of ninteen types. The explanation and illustration of these types will be taken up after dealing with the varieties of Pūrṇopamā.

The suffix 'Vat' can be used in two senses. The first occurs in the sense of the possessor of similarity (Sadṛśa) according to the sutra *'Tena tulyaṁ kriyacedvatiḥ'*[6]. The other in the sense of similarity[7]. The employment of the suffix 'Vat' in the sense of 'Iva' makes the Śrautī while the same suffix employed in the sense of 'Śardṛṣa' brings in Ārthī type. When the suffix 'Vat is used in the sense of 'Sādṛśya' there can be no construabilty of sense unless the common characteristic is expressed. Therefore, in Luptopamā there can be no 'anuktadharma' and Taddhitagatā śrautī'. If the suffixes 'Kalpap' and 'Deśiyar' are employed in the meaning of a 'little less' they indirectly convey similarity and hence the variety of Upamā that occurs is Ārthī. The six varieties of 'Pūrṇopamā' have been explained and illustrated as follows:

1. Vākyagāpurṇā Śrautī :

In the verse given as an example,[8] the four factors Upamāna, Upameya, Sādharaṇadharma and Upamāvācaka have been employed. The term 'Yathā' which directly expresses similarity is also employed. Since this has not been compounded with any other word the Upamā here, is based on a sentence. So this is an apt illustration

for 'Vakyagāpūrnaśrautī upamā'.

2. Samāsagāpūrnā śrauti :

In the verse given as an example [9] for this type the Sun who is seated on the east mountain is Upamāna where as Vīrarudra who is seated on throne is Upameya. The lustre is the common characteristic while 'Iva' is the sādṛśyavācaka. 'Bhāsvāniva' is taken as a compound in the light of the Vārtika *'Ivenasamāso vibhaktayalopaśca purvapadaprakṛti svartvamca'* This explanation is supplied by Kumārasvāmin in his learned commentary.[10]

3. Taddhitagāpūrṇa śrauti :

Here in the illustrative verse[11] the suffix 'Vat' which expresses similarity is employed in the sense of 'Iva' in accordance with the aphorism *'Tatra tasyeva'*. The words like tortoise are Upamāna, the shoulder of Pratāparudra is Upameya, capability to bear the burden is the common characteristic, 'Vat' being Vācaka, it is a case of 'Taddhitagā pūrṇā śrauti'.

4. Vākyagāpūrṇā Ārthī :

In the illustrative verse[12] Dāśarathi is Upamāna, Pratāparudra is Upameya, pleasing the people is the common characteristic and the term 'Samāna' which indirectly conveys similarity have been employed. Hence this is a case of Vakyagāpūrṇā Ārthī.

5. Samāsagāpūrṇā Ārthī :

In the illustrative verse [13] for this type, the ruler of the cardinal point is Upamāna, the king of the Kākati kingdom is Upameya, ideal rule is the common characteristic and the term Sankāśa is the Vācaka. Thus, it is a full simile. 'Haridiśvara Sankāśaḥ'shows that it is in a compound. As the word Sankāśaḥ is a member of the compound it is a case of

'Samāsagāpūrṇā'.

6. Taddhitagā pūrṇā Ārthi :

In the verse given as an example [14] for this type, it is said that Pratāparudra is equal to the mountain 'Meru' in greatness. In his valour he is like the Sun. In depth, he is like the milky ocean. The moutain 'Meru', the milky ocean and the Sun are Upamānas where as Pratāparudra is Upameya, greatness, valour and depth are the common characteristics. Here, the suffix employed is 'Vat' which is a Taddhita suffix.

Of the Ālaṅkārikas, who have spoken different varieties of Upamā, Udbhaṭa is the first writer to show the divisions based on the pecularities of grammar. The writers that followed him have not shown these varieties. It is Vidyānātha who revived the method of Udbhaṭa by illustrating each of the varieties based on grammatical peculiarities.

Now, Vidyānātha illustrates the different varieties in Luptopamā as follows :In the example given for 'Anuktadharma Vākyagā Śrautī luptā',[15] people are Upameya. Cakravāka birds etc., are Upmāna, the word Yathā is Vācaka. As the common characteristics Pratāpa, Āhlāda and Śārasya are not expressed it is Anuktadharma. It is to be observed here that the remark of Kumārasvāmisomapīthin stands in the way of proper understanding of the verse. It would be easy if the common characteristic is taken as 'taking delight'. In the second variety, Anuktadharmasamāsagā śrautīluptā the foot stool of Pratāparudra is said to be the Upameya and the diety is Upamāna. Iva is vācaka. Here the common characteristic is absent. So it is a case of Dharmaluptā. In the third, the sound of the battle drum is Upameya where as the sound of the thnderbolt is Upamāna. The word Tulya is Vācaka. By the word 'Tulya' the suggestion of being ferocious is meant, but it is not expressed and so it is a case of Anuktadharma. As

there is the word 'Tulya' as Sadṛśavācaka it is Ārthī. As it is not in a compounded it is Vākyagā. Hence it is a case of Anuktadharma Vākyagā ārthī luptā. In the fourth, the absence of common characteristic makes it a case of Dharmaluptā. As the Vācaka Sadṛśa is a member of the compound it is Samasagatā and the employment of common characteristic makes it Ārthī. Here the Upamāna is the town Alakā. The Upameya is the town Ekaśilā. Hence it is a case of Anukatadharma Samāsagā ārthi luptā. In the fifth the common chacracteristic is absent. So it becomes Anuktadharma. Here the form of Pratāparudra is the Upameya and Cupid is the Upamāna. The employment of the suffix 'Kalpap' is Taddhita and hence it is Taddhitagā Ārthī. So, it is a case of Anuktadharma Taddhitagā Ārthi luptā.

In the sixth as both the common characteristic as well as the Sādṛsyavācaka are not expressed it is a case of Luptopamā. Here ocean is the Upameya and milky-ocean is the Upamāna. The common characteristic whiteness is not mentioned. The particle 'iva' too is absent. Hence this is a case of Anuktadharmevādiḥ karma kyacā luptā. In the seventh the Sādṛśyavācaka is included in the suffix 'Kyac'. Here the Upameya is Gotra mountain and the hill for play is the Upamāna. Hence it is a case of Anukta karmevadiḥādhārakyacā luptā. In the eighth both the common characteristic and the term expressing similarity are absent while the latter is concealed in the suffix 'ṇamul'. Here the moon is the Upameya and the sun is the Upamāna. Hence this is a case of Anuktadharmevādiḥ Karmaṇamulā luptā. Coming to the ninth the term expressing similarity is absent in view of the usage of the suffix namul. Similarly the Common characteristic is also absent. Here the sword of Pratāparudra is the Upameya and the punishing rod etc., is the Upamāna. Hence this is a case of Anuktadharmevādiḥ Kartṛṇamulā lupta. In the tenth the other items being common there is the employment of the suffix 'Kvip'. The moon light like qualities of Pratāparudra is the Upameya and the flow

of ambrosia etc., is the Upamāna. Hence, this is a case of Anuktadharmevādiḥ Kvipā luptā.

In the eleventh, similarity, the term expressing similarity and the Upameya are absent. The Upameya and the term expressing similarity get elided on account of grammatical implications involved in the employment of the suffix 'Kyac'. Here the form of fame which is in accusative is the Upameya. Jyotsnā in the accusative is the Upamāna. Hence it is a case of Anuktadharmevādiḥ Kartṛkyacā luptā. In the twelfth three are absent and these three are to be known through 'Kyan'. Here the hands of Pratāparudra are the Upameya and the serpent Śeṣa is the Upamāna. Hence this is a case of Anuktadharmevādiḥ Kartṛ Kyaṅā lupta. In the thirteenth Upamāna only is absent. In the illustration *'Vadānyo nānyosti'* etc., [16] there is the denial of Upamāna alone. The term Sama expressing similarity is not in a compound. Hence this is a case of Anuktopamāna Vākyagā lupta. In the fourteenth variety there is the employement of the term expressing similarity in a compound and as in the above case there is elision ofthe Upamāna. In the verse illustrated *'Vīrarudra samo rājā'*etc.,[17] it is said that there is no other king comparable to Pratāparudra. Thus there is elision of Upamāna. So this is a case of Anuktopamānasamāsagā luptā. In the fifteenth both the common characteristic and the Upamāna are not expressed. In the verse *'Loke Kākati Vīrarudranṛpateḥ* [18] etc., it is said that there is nothing in the world that equals the fame of Pratāparudra. Thus there is the elision of Upamāna and also there is no mention about the common characteristic. Hence this is a case of Anuktadharmopamāna vākyagā luptā.

While illustrating the sixteenth variety Vidyānātha composes the verse *'Pratāpaśrītulyaḥ'* etc.[19]. One finds the elision of the common characteristic and the Upamāna. Since the word that conveys similarity is in the compound it is a case of samasagā luptā. So this is a case of 'Anuktadharmopamāna samasagā luptā'. In the seventeenth,

the term expressing similarity is absent. In the verse *'Asatāmuṣṇabhānuṣṇam'* etc. [20] there is deletion of the term that conveys similarity. Hence this is a case of Anuktevādiḥ samasagā luptā. In eighteenth, the verse illustrated in *'Kākatīndra raṇe bhāti'* [21] etc. Here is the deletion of the common characteristic, the term that conveys similarity and Upamāna. Hence this is a case of Anuktadharmevādyupamāna samāsagā luptā.

The common characteristic is of two kinds. Sometimes it is mentioned only once as related to Upamāna and Upameya, or it may be mentioned separate as belonging to them. When there is separate mention there can be Vastuprativastubhāva or Bimbapratibimbabhāva. When thecommon characteristic is expressed by two different terms it is 'Vastuprativastubhāva'. If two characteristics are expressed by two different terms it is Bimbapratibimbabhāva. The first variety where the common characteristic is employed only once is illustrated in the verse-

'Nṛpaḥ praṇatamūrdhānaḥ' etc. [22] Here in the case of kings and disciples, the common characteristic 'with bent down heads' is employed only once. Similarly in the case of the king and the precepter, the common characteristic is disciplining the indisciplined.

In the verse "Vaṁśo'yaṁ kākatīyānām" etc.,[23] the Vastuprativastubhāva is illustrated. Here the two terms Bhūṣita and Pariskrta convey the same idea. Hence it is an instance of Vastuprativastubhāva. As regards Bimbapratibimbabhāva the illustrated verse is *'Sphurat svtetapatraśrīḥ'* etc.[24] Here there is similarity between the disc of the moon and the white umbrella. This similarity brings about the similarity between the king of the Kākati dynasty and the golden mountain. Hence this is a case of Bimbapratibimbabhava. The figure Upamā is again of two types :

1. That deals with all aspects.

2. That applies only in a particular aspect.

The verse *'Vibhūtibhūrdyauriva'* etc.[25] the first variety is illustrated. In the verse *'Dvipaiścaradbhiḥ'* etc.,[26] the second variety is illustrated. Here the idea that the army is like the ocean is known though unexpressed. This figure is also seen in the series. The verse *'Kundati Kumudati'* etc.,[27] there are many Upamānas for a single Upameya. In the figure Upama the similarity is even as it is based on 'Bhedābhedasādharaṇa'. Other varieties whch are not mentioned here, may also be known.

2. ANANVAYA :

The figure Ananvaya occurs where the same object is treated as both Upamāna and Upameya. This is done with a view to convey that there is no other object comparable to the one under context. The verse *'Vīrarudroyam vīrarudra iva svayam'* etc.[28] is the illustration given.

Here Vīrarudrá is both Upamāna and Upameya. Hence it results that there is no other person comparable to him.

3. UPAMEYOPAMĀ :

When two things are alternatively dealt with as Upamāna and Upameya, the figure is Upameyopamā. In the figure Ananvaya, Upamanopameyabhāva is experessed in a single sentence where as in this figure it resorts to two separate sentences. The example which has already been given under upama is follows : *'Dharmo'rtha iva pūrṇaśrīḥ'* etc. Here Dharma and Artha are alternatively treated as the Upamāna and the Upameya.

4. SMARAṆA :

Among the figures which are based on

'Bhedabhedasādhāraṇasādharmya', the last is Smaraṇālaṅkāra. When a particular thing is experienced, the recollection of a thing similar to it constitute the figure Smaraṇa.In the verse given as an example 'Rajñā pratāparudreṇa' etc., it is stated that the people in the reign of Pratāparudra recollected the great kings Hariścandra, Nala etc., Rudraṭa is said to be the first Ālaṅkārika to define this figure. Mammaṭa and Viśvanātha define Smaraṇa as the recollection of a particular object when a similar one is seen.[29] Kumārasvāmin observes that this figure has no place in cases where the recollection is not based on similarity. Hence, in the verse *'Atrānugodam mṛgayā nivṛttaḥ'* etc.,[30] does not illustrate the figure Smaraṇa.

5. RŪPAKA :

There are some figures here based on super-imposition. Rūpaka is the first amongst them.The definition of Rūpaka given Vidyānātha is as follows :

> *'Āropaviṣayasya syādatirohitarūpiṇaḥ I*
>
> *Uparañjakamāropyamāṇaṁ tadrūpakaṁmatam'* [31] *II*

Here in the definition, by virtue of the word 'Aropyaviṣayasya' there is exclusion of Utprekṣā which is based on Adhyavasāya. Upamā also differs from Rūpakā because there is no super imposition. By the word 'atirohitarūpa' there is the exclusion of such figures like Sandeha, Bhrāntimat, Apahnuti etc. In Sandeha the Viṣaya on account of its being the object of doubt, gets eclipsed. In the figure Bhrāntimat also there is the eclipse of the Viṣaya by Bhrānti or delusion. In the figure Aphahnuti too, on account of concealment, there is the eclipse of the Viṣaya. The word Uparañjaka helps the exclusion of the figure Pariṇāma. In Pariṇāma the Viṣayi is only useful in the context, but it does not serve as Uparañjaka. Hence, the difference. In the conclusion Rūpaka is different from all other figures

based on similarity and super-imposition.

The figure Rūpaka is of eight kinds. First, it is of three types - Sāvayava, Niravayava and Pāramparita. Sāvayavarūpaka is again of two kinds Samastavastuviṣaya and Ekadeśavarti. Niravayava too is of two types Kevalā and Mālā. Pāramparita is also of two types that involve Śleṣa and that does not involve Śleṣa. These two varieties again become four as based on Kevalā and Mālā. Thus all the varieties put together become eight. Super-imposition is the process where the characteristic of one object is attributed to another.

To illustrate the first variety, Vidyānātha quotes the verse *'Yatraprāvṛṣi vīrarudranṛpateḥ'* etc.[32] Here 'Yaśaḥ kandalaḥ' is the 'aṅgirūpaka' and the rest are 'aṅgarūpakas'. Hence this is an illustration for Samastavastuviṣaya.

The second type is illustrated in the verse *'Prasādhitāśāvalayāntarāla'* etc.[33] Here, there is super-imposition of flowers on the qualities of Pratāparudra. The Rūpaka related to the king and the 'Kalpa' tree is suggested. Hence, this is Ekadeśavivarti Rūpaka.

The third variety is illustrated in the verse *'Yatrārambhavijṛmbhamāna'* etc.[34] Here there is only avayava Rūpaka where there is a super imposition of cauldron on the Rodas.

The fourth variety i.e., 'Mālāniravayava' is illustrated in the verse *'Rājñāṁ maulivibhūṣaṇa sragamālā'* etc.[35]. Here there is a series of metaphors unconnected and independent.

The next variety 'Pāramparita' is illustrated in the verse *'Pratāparudradevasya'* etc.[36] Since the word 'Rajamaṇḍala' is Śliṣṭa it is a case of Sliṣṭa pāramparita. The same in series is illustrated in the verse *'Padmollāsa sahasrabhānu'* etc.[37] This variety is seen even without Śleṣa. To illustrate Aśliṣṭakevalapāramparita. *'Kākatīyasya*

dugdhābdheḥ' etc.[38] is the verse given. Again series of the same is seen illustrated in the verse '*Dorasivisajihvayā*' etc.[39] This Aśliṣṭamālāpāramparita variety is also possible with dissimilar characteristics. For instance, in the verse '*Trāsāndhakāramadhyāhna*' etc.[40], opposite factors like Andhakāra, and Madhyāhna have been employed. Thus the eight varieties of Rūpaka have been illustrated and explained. These eight varieties become sixteen when based on a sentence or a compound.

6. PARIṆĀMA :

Pariṇāma is the figure where the super-imposed object incapable of accomplishing the desired action, takes the form of the contextual object. It is to be noted that the earlier Ālaṅkarikas fail to define this figure. It is also note worthy that Viśvanātha the contemporary of Vidyānātha defines Pariṇāma.[41] This Pariṇāma is of two types based on the factors 'Sāmānādhikaraṇya' and 'Vaiyadhikaraṇya'. In the verse '*Śaśvat Prasādhana*' etc.,[42] the words expressing both Viṣaya and Viṣayī have the same case ending. Hence, this verse illustrates the first type of Pariṇāma. As regards the second Vidyānātha presents the verse

'*Kirīṭamāṇikyamayūkhajālaiḥ*' etc.[43]

Here the word conveying Viṣayi carries accusative singular suffix while that of the Viṣaya carries instrumental plural suffix. Thus it is a case of Vaiyadhikaraṇya pariṇāma.

In the figure Samasokti, though the super-imposed idea is useful in the contextual action, it is different from Pariṇāma as in Samasokti it is suggested and not expressed.

7. SANDEHA :

When the Upamāna and the Upameya become a matter of doubt

on account of similarity, the figure is Sandeha. In the treatment of the figure sandeha there is a close resemblence of the concept between Vidyānātha and Viśvanātha.[44] There is the difference in nomenclature between Vidyānātha and Bhoja as the latter calls it as Vitarka. While Bhāmha is silent Daṇḍin includes this figure under comparison. Mammata, however defines that Sandeha occurs in both the cases whether the difference between Upamāna and Upameya is expressed [45] or not. According to both Viśvanātha and Vidyānātha the figure Sandeha is of three types i. Śuddha, ii. Niścayagarbha and iii. Niscayānta.

Where simple doubt without any conclusion has been described, it is Śuddha, the verse *'Kimeṣā navamo haritpatiḥ'* etc., is the illustration. Where certainity has been concealed and not expressed, there it is Niścayagarbha. *'Kalāhihkimayam'* etc.,[46] is the verse given in this connection as an illustration. Where there is culmination in definiteness the third variety of Sandeha occurs *'Kim Kalpadrumamañjarisraja ime'* etc.[47] is the illustration given.

8. BHARĀNTIMAT :

When the Upameya becomes eclipsed by Upamāna due to similarity the figure is Bhrāntiman. The similarity should be acceptable to the connoiseur. Thus the illusions like silver in oyster and the serpent in a rope are excluded because in such places the similarity is not acceptable to poets and connoiseurs. The difference between the Rūpaka and the Bhrāntimat is evident as the comparison in the Rūpaka is intentional. One may infer that Daṇḍin's Mahopama is nothing but the Bhrāntiman through his illustration.[48] In the illustrated verse it is observed that all pervasive fame of Pratāparudra has been mistaken as the moon light by the Cakora birds.

9. APAHNAVA :

On account of similarity if the Viṣaya is negated as such and another is super-imposed in its place, the figure is Apahnuti. It is of three types.

i. Concealment and then superimposition.

ii. First superimposition and then concealment.

iii. The employment of words like "Chala" etc., in order to express falsification.

Vidyānātha closely follows Ruyyaka in defining Aphnuti as having three varieties .[49] On the other hand, neither Daṇḍin nor Viśvanātha speak of the three aspects of this figure.[50] *'Udvelacaturārṇavikalākalāḥ'* etc.,[51] is the verse where in the first two varieties are illustrated. For the third variety *'Sarvaṁkākativīrarudradharaṇī'* etc.,[52] is shown as an example.

10. ULLEKHA :

When a single object is viewed differently either for a certain purpose or poetic fancy or Śleṣa, the figure is Ullekha. In the example given for the poetic facny [53] the capital of Vīrarudra has been taken as the dwelling of lords like Śrinivāsa by different kings according to their own taste. In the second type [54] the king of Kākati has been described in various ways by various poets through Śleṣa.

11. UTPREKṢĀ :

Utprekṣā is the figure based on Adhyavasāya. This Adhyavasāya is of two types :

i. Where the Viṣayī has been concealed and

ii. Where the Viṣaya has been concealed.

Utprekṣā is the figure where one object on account of some characteristics related to another is fancied as that object. Again, it is of two kinds as expressed and suggested. Where terms like Nūnam, (Dhruvaṁ), Prāyaḥ etc., that express fancy are employed, it is a case of expressed figure. Where the above have not been employed the figure is said to be suggested. Basing on species, activity, quality and matter (Jati, Kriyā, Guṇa and Dravya) it is again of four kinds. Again on the criteria of existence and non-existence, it becomes eight fold. These eight varieties become sixteen when quality and action have been chosen as the cause for fancying. When it is suggested, it is another variety. These two occur only in the figure when it is expressed. In the suggested figure, however, these two figures fail to occur as the figure becomes supportless on account of non-employment of 'iva' etc., and the cause. Similarly species, action, quality and matter can individually be dealt with in three ways :

i. in its own form

ii. as a cause, and

iii. as the fruit.

Thus the figure comes to have many varieties. In the figure expressed, when cause or fruit has been fancied, the means of fancying should necessarily be employed. If the fruit has not been mentioned, simple mention of the means is not easily understood. Similarly, when the means fail to be mentioned, employment of fruit also becomes unintelligible. This is because both are so closely interrelated. In Hetūtprekṣā, the fruit is the means. If it is not employed, the fancying of the cause becomes meaningless. In the case of Phalotprekṣā the means is the cause and if it is not employed it also becomes confusing. Kumārasvāmin calculates the number of varieties to be ninetysix.

Now, Vidyānātha goes to illustrate different varieties of Utprekṣā. In the verse *'Pratāparudra nṛpaterapāro kīrtisāgare'* etc.,[55] the means

is submerging and the cause submitted is contact with the notoriety of the bad kings. In another illustration *'Jayaśrīvāsapadmasya'* etc.,[56] the means is the entrance of the Sun in the sword of the king. The fruit is to make the lotus blossom. Both these factors require to be mentioned, as without them, the body of the figure becomes in comprehensible. So, only in Svarūpotprekṣā, we have two varieties basing on the employment and non-employment of the means. Thus Vidyānātha arrives at fourteen varieties of the figure when it is expressed. Similarly Jātyutprekṣā also has fourteen varieties. Those based on quality, action and matter also have similar varieties. Thus, summing up, there arise fiftysix varieties in the expressed figure. In the figure suggested, however, there can be only forty two varieties.

In Svarūpotprekṣā, however, since the means has necessarily to be mentioned, there is scope only for one variety. Earlier writers, however,accept quality and action (Guṇa and Kriyā) as menas and object in the figure.

Though ninetysix varieties have been mentioned, only fiftysix of them have charm. Here follows the illustration of some of the varieties. To illustrate 'Upāttagunanimittajātibhāvasvarūpotprekṣā',Vidyānātha composes the verse *'Kīrtiḥ Kākati vīra rudranṛpateḥ'* etc.[57] Here the word 'Prabhā' expresses the species. Here one can not speak of Upamā since the laughter of the three worlds is a poetical fancy and is not real.

The verse *'Vīrasya rudranṛpateḥ priyavallabhasya'* etc.,[58] illustrates the variety 'Upāttakriyānimittajātibhāva svrūpotprekṣā'. Here the horripulation is fancied. To be pleased is the means. The verse 'Pratāparudrasya nakhendukāntiḥ' etc.,[59] illustrates the variety 'Anupāttanimittajātibhāva svarūpotprekṣā'. Here, in the statement 'dipikeva' the word 'dipikā' stands for species and it is fancied.

To illustrate the variety 'Upāttaguṇanimittajātyabhāva svarūpotprekṣā', Vidyānātha gives the verse *'Pratāparudrasya guṇāmṛtormidhauta'* etc.[60] The figure is suggested here as there is no word expressing fancy. The variety 'Anupāttanimita jatyabhāva svarūpotprekṣā' is seen illustrated in the verse *'Diśamjeturviśvaprasṛtamahaso'* etc.[61] Here the statement 'asūryam' shows that it is a case of absence of species.

Next, *'Udārarītyā bhujayā pratāparudrasya'* etc.,[62] illustrates 'Jātihetūtprekṣā.' Here, the species, has been chosen as the cause of fancying. Another variety 'Jatyabhāva hetūtprekṣā' is illustrated by the verse *'Bhūmerakalpavṛkṣatvāditidhāta'* etc.[63] Here, the absence of 'Kalpa' tree shows that the absence of its species has been chosen as a cause.The same species has been chosen as a cause. The same species has been fancied as the fruit in the verse *'Nūnam viśvambharādhāra'* etc.[64] Here the statement 'stambhībhavitum' shows that the species is chosen as the fruit. The absence of species is sometimes chosen as the fruit. This is seen illustrated in the verse *'Pasūnavadhyānālokya'*[65] etc. Here the absence of manliness is chosen as the fruit. Now, 'Kriyāsvarūpotprekṣā' is seen illustrated in the verse *'Śrīkākatīyanṛpaterdviṣadaṅganānām'* etc.[66] Here 'pratyuttaranidadatīva' shows that it is a case of 'Kriyāsvarūpotprekṣā' Sometimes the absence of action becomes the object of fancying. In the verse *'Vimukhesati Kākatikṣitindre'* etc.,[67] the absence of offer as expressed by the term 'ādadānām' is fancied. Again, the verse *'Rājñām garvāṅkurod bhedaḥ'* etc.,[68] has the action as its cause for fancying. The verse *'Kapolaphalakāvasyāḥ Katham bhūtvā'* etc,[69] illustrates the variety Kriyāhetvābhāvotprekṣā. In the verse *'Dambholisamrambha mahājigopaḥ'*[70] etc., the action has been fancied as the fruit. The absence of action, too sometimes is chosen as the fruit of fancying. In the verse *'Simādrikuñjeṣu vihārabhājaḥ'* etc.,[71] the statement 'asaṁsprastumiva' shows Kriyābhava or actionlessness.

Now the varieties based on qualities are illustrated. In the verse, *'Cakāsti Kākatīndrasya Kṛpālokanavibhramaḥ'* etc.[72] Prasada or grace which is a quality is fancied. In the verse 'Pratāparudrasya mahābhiṣeka' etc.,[73] the absence of quality is fancied. In the verse 'Jayaśriyāmā śrayatāmupetaḥ' etc.,[74] a quality has been fancied as the cause. In the statement 'asyaeva' the quality jealousy is chosen as the cause for fancying. The verse 'Jātāvayaṁ samprati' etc.,[75] illustrates the same. Here, the statement 'apramodādiva' shows that the absence of 'pramoda' is chosen as a cause. We find quality sometimes is fancied as the fruit. In the verse 'Āśiṣām viṣadhūmrānām' etc.[76] purity which is a quality is fancied as the fruit. In the verse *'Aṇyavāsārjitabāndhavāsu'* etc.,[77] the absence of a quality is fancied as the fruit. Here, the absence of rivalry is chosen as the fruit. The verse *'Nanityamasmin paripūrṇateti'* etc.,[78] illustrates the variety Dravyasvarūpotprekṣā. Here, the moon is Dravya. In the following verse *'Ananyasādhāraṇadānasauṇḍe'* etc.,[79] the absence of Dravya is fancied. In this verse the heaven is fancied as not having the tree Pārijata. The same Dravya sometimes is chosen as the cause. In the verse *'Pratāparudradevana Kṣmābhṛtpakṣa'* etc.,[80] the statement 'apareṇeva vajriṇā' shows that Dravya has been chosen as the cause. In the following verse *'Kākatiyapratapoṣma vilīnāṅgena meruṇā'* etc.,[81] the absence of Dravya is fancied as the cause. Sometimes, we find Dravuya as the fruit in fancying. In the verse 'Dugdhārṇava śaṭāyeva' etc.,[82] Dravya has been chosen as the fruit. Sometimes even Dravyābhāva' is chosen as the fruit of fancying. Here in the verse *'Vīrarudra narendrasya jayaprasthāna sambhavam'* etc.,[83] the globe concealed by dust is fancied as having no space. Thus some of the prominent varieties of Utprekṣā have been illustrated. The illustrations of the other varieties, however, can be known in different places of Poetry.

12. ATIŚAYOKTI :

While the Utprekṣā is based on sādhyasādhyavasāya, the Atiśayokti is based on Siddhasādhyavasaya. Where the Upameya gets elided by poetic genius and where only Upamāna is mentioned, there the figure is Atiśayokti. This is of four types :

i. to say non-difference in difference,

ii. to mention difference in non-difference,

iii. in cases where there is the absence of relation is mentioned, and

iv. to mention relationship where there is no relationship.

A fifth case where the sequence of cause and effect is reversed, is mentioned under this figure. Though this variety fails to have Adhyavasāya as its basis, it has the poetic ingenuity to qualify it as one of the varieties of this figure. Now, Vidyānātha proceeds to illustrate the varieties one by one.

In the verse given as an example for Bhedābhedātiśayokti *'Sthāne Kalpatarūrjataḥ'* etc.,[84] Abhedhādhyavasāya has been effected between Pratāparudra and Kalpavṛkṣa. In the verse given as an example for Abhedabhedātiśayokti,[85] though there is no difference in the qualities of Pratāparudra, a difference has been mentioned. In the verse given to illustrate Sambandhātiśayokti,[86] though Pratāparudra has been the creation of the creator, it is said that he is not created by the creator. In the verse given as an example for the fourth type, though there was no such conversation between the Brahman and the Viṣṇu, it has been said as having taken place between them. The fifth type stands for Kāryakāraṇa paurvāparya viparyayātiśayokti. To illustrate this type, Vidyānātha composes the verse 'Mātaḥ katham Kākatinātha' etc.[87] Here, the effect is the fall of Cupid's arrow. The cause is the fall of the sight of Pratāparudra. The sequence of the cause and the effect

has been reversed. Hence, this is a case of the fifth variety of Atiśayokti. There may be a sixth type where simultaneity for cause and effect has been mentioned. But this comes under the scope of the figure Sahokti.

13 SAHOKTI :

Sahokti is the figure where there is construability between two things. This should be based on Atiśayokti or exaggeration and should culminate in conveying similarity. Here, the similarity is not factual. It has two types, namely, Kāryakāraṇa viparyayātiśayoktimūlaka Sahokti and the Sahokti which is based on Bhedābhedātiśayokti. In the example *'Andhrakṣmābhṛtsubhaṭāśidhārā'* etc., [88] it is said that the edges of the sword and the celestrical garlands simultaneously fall on the necks of the enemy kings. Here the fall of the sword is the cause and the fall of the celestial garlands, is the effect. Here both have been said to take place at the same moment. In the example for the second type *'Dine dine rudra narādhipasya'* etc.,[89] there is Śleṣa between the Udaya mountains and the prosperity. Thus the second variety, here is based on Śleṣa.

14 VINOKTI :

Where an object is spoken of as devoid of beauty or ugliness on account of the absence of some other object, the figure is Vinokti. Vinokti is of two types as 'Aramyatāvinokti' and 'Ramyatāvinokti'. In the example given for the first type [90] it is said that there is no beauty for the poetic piece, without the description of the qualities of Pratāparudra. In the second verse it is said that when Pratāparudra shines, the moon can only shine without his stain.[91]

15. SAMĀSOKTI :

Due to the similarity in Ukti, Samāsokti is being explained after Vinokti. There is difference of opinion among the Ālaṅkārikas

regarding this figure. While Bhāmaha considers Samāsokti as an expression intended to convey a suggestion, Daṇḍin opines it as a succinct expression in itself.[92] Mammaṭa speaks of the presence of paronomastic adjectives in Samāsokti as the means to suggest some other things.[93] Viśvanātha, on the otherhand, divides it into three categories viz., Samakāryottha, Samāliṅgottha and Samaviśeṣaṇottha i.e., based on similarity of action, gender and attribute. [94]

However, according to Vidyānātha if a non-contextual idea strikes on account of commonness of attributes related to a contextual idea, the figure is Samāsokti. Broadly speaking, this is of three types.

i. Śliṣṭaviśeṣaṇasāmyamūlā

ii. Sādhāraṇaviśeṣaṇamūlā

iii. Aupamyagarbhviśeṣaṇamūlā

In the verse given as an example for the first variety, [95] the loosening of the girdle, horripulation, Rāga are the Śliṣṭa words. Due to the capacity of Kṛpāṇalatikā, the suggestion of a particular Prauḍha heroine has been made. In the same way in the words Anuraktā, Bhāvavivasa etc., pertaining to enemy kings, there is the suggestion of erotic heroes. In the illustrative verse for the second type, [96] as the adjectives for the sentiments of erotics and furious are common, there is a suggestion of the affair related to hero and the heroine. In these two cases the suggested idea is Śṛṅgārarasābhāsa as there is the suggestion of many heroes. In Rasaprakaraṇa Vidyānātha quotes :

'Ekatraivānurāgascet tiryaṅ mlecchagato 'piva I

Yoṣito bahusaktiścedrasābhāsastridhā mataḥ' [97] *II*

In the verse given as an illustration for the third variety, the attributes *'guṇaratnaughaiḥ'* [98] etc., have an element of similarity in

themselves. This similarity enables one to get the suggestion of an ocean. Aprakṛtavyavahāra samāropa i.e., the super-imposition of the affair of a non-contextual object is sine-que-non of Samāsokti. This Vyavahārasamāropa is of four kinds. Sometimes an idea related to the world is super - imposed on another idea related to the world, which is contextual. It may sometimes be an idea related to any of the wellknown sciences. Similarly an idea related to a particular science may be super-imposed on another idea related to a different science. Or an idea related to the world can also be super-imposed on an idea related to a science.

Kumārasvāmin in his commentary brings out the difference between Samāsokti and Rūpaka. The super-imposition of a non-contextual on the contextuul is the chief characteristic of Samāsokti. There is an argument that since this element is present even in Rūpaka, Samāsokti can as well be included under Rūpaka. But the difference is this :

In Rūpaka we see Aprakṛtavastu svarūpāropa i.e., the super imposition of a non-contextual object while in Samāsokti one can see Aprakṛtavastu vyavahārāropa i.e., the super imposition of the affair of a non-contextual object. Thus one cannot be included in the other.

The verse *'Saptāṅgasphuraduddāma Dānalakṣmī'* etc.,[99] is given as an example for the first variety. Here, there is super - imposition of the affair of the cordinal elephant named Sārvabhauma on a contextual idea related to the world.

The verse *'Gurupramāṇena nijena'* etc.,[100] illustrates the super-imposition of the idea of logic on the worldly affair related to Prataparudra.

In the verse *'Apūrvārthaślāghāguru'* etc.[101] there is super-imposition of an idea related to Tantraśāstra on an idea related to Alaṅkāraśāstra.

In the verse *'Sālaṅkārā lasadvarṇa'* etc.,[102] the affair of a heroine is super-imposed on an idea related to Alaṅkāraśāstra.

16. VAKROKTI :

If a statement made to express some idea gives a different idea also by virtue of Kāku or Śleṣa, there the figure is Vakrokti. Though all figures are of different kinds of expression (Uktivaicitrya) Vakrokti differs from them all by virtue of peculiarity of its definition.Vakrokti is said to be of two types i.e., Kākumūlavakrokti and Śleṣamūlavakrokti. In the verse which is given as an illustration for the former,[103] it is said that a maid of a heroine consoles her madam who is distressed for the non arrival of her beloved. In the first part of the verse, it is said that though the king (the beloved) is attached to many women he is particularly in love with a Nāyikā named 'Śrī'. Here, by virtue of Kāku; it is known that the lady is no way inferior to 'Śrī'. Hence she need not have any sense of inferiority about herself.

In the verse which is given as an example for the latter type[104] the maid takes other meaning than the intended one by the capacity of Śleṣa. Here, the words 'Rājā', Kṣoṇibhṛttilakaḥ', 'Rudradeva' and Gotrasārodbhava' are paranomastically used. Hence the other senses, moon, mountain, Lord Śiva and goddess Pārvati help the conveyance of a second sense.

17. SVABHĀVOKTI :

Svābhāvokti is one where the description is made beautifully resorting to the reality. In the illustrative verse 'Madaścuta nartita karṇatālam' etc.[105] the behaviour of an elephant has been realistically described.

18. VYĀJOKTI :

The concealment of a particular thing basing on concealed

similarity is Vyājokti. In the ilustrative verse [106] the horripulation due to receival of the hand of the 'Kṣoṇī' is concealed and is presented to the coolness of the water brought for coronation anointment.

Vāmana is the first Ālaṅkārika who mentions this figure under the name 'Māyokti' [107] The definitions of Mammaṭa and Viśvanātha correspond to each other [108]. It is to be noted that Jagannātha does not mention this figure at all.

19. MĪLANA :

When a thing has been concealed by another, the figure is Mīlana. This is of two types. The concealment of an outward feature by an innate one and vice versa. The first variety is illustrated in the verse *'Ugraiḥkākativīrarudranṛpateḥ'* etc., [109] in which it is said that the natural or innate head due to cupid eclipses the one due to travel in the desert. The second is illustrated in the verse *'Pratāparudrasya bhujaprabhāvat'* etc., [110] Here the innate feature is shivering etc., due to love for one's beloved. The outward feature, however, is one due to fear.The former has been concealed by the latter.

Rudraṭa may be considered as the first one among the ancient Ālaṅkārikas to mention this figure .[111] In the figure Vyājokti if the pretext which conceals a particular thing is important, in the figure Apāhnuti the thing that has been hidden deserves emphasis. But in the figure Mīlana we find a particular thing hiding in another, for, the excellence of one eclipses the other. [112]

20. SĀMĀNYA :

When an object on account of its similarity with another cannot be differentiated, the figure is Sāmānya. The verse given for illustration is *'Kailāsadugdhārṇavayānahamse'* etc. [113] Here the mountain Kailasa, milky oecan and the swan of Brahman could not be distinguished on

account of their non-difference with the fame of Pratāparudra.

Mammaṭa is said to be the first Ālaṅkārika to define this figure.[114]

21. TADGUṆA :

Leaving one's inferior qualities, if an object takes up the superior qualities of another nearby, the figure is Tadguṇa. The verse *'Pratāparudradevāṅghrinakha'* etc.,[115] illustrates this figure. Here it has been said that the gems steded in the crown of the king leave their red clolour and take up the white colour of the nails of the feet of Pratāparudra. There is no considerable difference in the concept of this figure among Ālaṅkārikas.[116]

22. ATADGUAN :

If a thing does not receive the qualities of some other thing inspite of the presence of a sound reason, the figure is Atadguṇa.[117] In the illustrative verse *'Iśānāṁ samayā jagatyatati'* etc., it is said that despite the fact that lord Śiva is shining in his white colour, Viṣṇu in his blue colour and the creator Brahman in his gold colour, the fame of Pratāparudra roams in the three worlds with its own effulgence.

23. VIRODHA :

When an inconsistency that is apprehended in the beginning stands answered later, the figure is Virodha. The figure Virodha is of ten types as follows :

When there is inconsistency of 'Jāti' with the factors 'Jāti' etc., there arise four varieties. Similarly the inconsistency of 'Kriyā with Kriyā' etc., gives rise to three varieties. Again 'Guṇa' when it is inconsistent with 'Guṇa' and 'Dravya' there arise two varieties. Lastly 'Dravya' when it is inconsistent with another "Dravya' gives rise to one variety. Thus in total the figure Virodha comes to have ten varieties. Viśvanātha also

endorses this view [115]. But Jagannātha accepts only two varieties as Śuddha and Śleṣamūla, dismissing the classification based on Jāti etc., on the ground that it is not beautiful. [119]

However, Vidyānātha illustrates all the ten varieties as follows : In the verse *'Padmākaropivilasati'* etc.,[120] there is conflict between one Jāti and another Jāti and also there is conflict between Jāti and Kriyā. Here in the first part of the verse, it is said that the lake is without water (jaḍa). Hence it illustrates the first variety. In the second part of the verse, there is 'Jāti kriyāvirodha' It is said, here, that the flow of pure water causes grief. Thus there is Jātikriyāvirodha. Here it is based on Slesa as the words 'Jaḍa and 'Taravari' involve two senses.

'In the verse 'Amadaḥ sārvabhaumo'pi' etc., [121] there is inconsistency between 'Jāti' and 'Guṇa' and between 'Jāti' and 'Dravya'. Though the king is a Sarvabhauma, he is unintoxicated. This illustration shows the inconsistency between 'Jāti' and 'Guṇa'. Again the statement *'Bhāsvānapi kalanidhiḥ'* illustrates inconsistency between 'Jāti' and 'Dravya'. Here too, there is the basis of 'Śleṣa.'

In the verse *'Dharmadviṣāmarthamuṣamca'* etc., [122] there is conflict between one 'Kriyā' and another 'Kriyā'. It is said that the one who defeats the enemies of 'Dharma' and 'Artha' feels effection towards the enemy of 'Kāma'. Thus there is conflict between one Kriyā and another.

In the verse *'Eṣajiṣṇuvihāropigotravātsalya'* etc.,[123] there is conflict between 'Kriyā' and 'Guṇa' and 'Kriyā' and 'Dravya'. The statement *'Jisnuviharasya gotravātsalya'* illustrates 'Kriyāguṇavirodha' Similarly the statement *'Kamalollāsamkurvannapiraja'* illustrate the inconsistency between "Kriyā" and "Dravya". Here too, there is the basis of "Śleṣa".

In the verse *'Rañjayan bhuvanamidam rājeti'* etc.,[124] inconsistency between one 'Guṇa' and another 'Guṇa' is illustrated. The statement *'Sa raktāpi pāṇḍurajata'* speaks of inconsistency between two Guṇas. In the verse *'Jvalatpratāparudro'pi kākatīya nareśvaraḥ'* etc.,[125] inconsistency between 'Guṇa' and 'Dravya' has been illustrated. *'Jvalatpratāparudro'pijaivatṛkaḥ'* involves this inconsistency.

In the verse *'Vibhātikākatīndro'yam rudro'pi caturānanaḥ'* etc.[126] there is inconsistency between one 'Dravya' and another. The statements *'Rudropi caturānanaḥ', 'Jiṣṇurapi puruṣottamaḥ'*[127] bring out this inconsistency. Finally, Vidyānātha observes that this figure is seen illustrated even without Śleṣa. To illustrate this, he mentions the verse 'Svabhāvaśiśiratva' and 'Tāpinitva'. Thus the ten varieties of the figure have been illustrated.

24. VIŚEṢA :

The figure Viśeṣa is of three types :

i. The presence of an object without any substratum

ii. appearance of a single object in different places, and

iii. accomplishment of an impossible thing.

In the verse given as an example for the variety of 'Ādhārarahita ādheya', it is said that though the kings like Nala, Nahuṣa etc., are no more, still their fame continues to exists.[128] Here the kings Nalu etc., are substra.a and their fame is the thing that abides, i.e., Ādheya. In the illustration "Paśyanto bhayavihvalaḥ"[129] etc., it is said that Pratāparudra was seen by the enemy kings in different places at the same time on account of fear. In the illustration "Apārakaruṇānidheḥ" etc.,[130] it is stated that an ordinary person on account of the compassionate glance of Pratāparudra becomes superior to all. This is something impossible. Thus these verses illustrate the second and

third types respectively.

25. ADHIKA :

When there is incompatibility between the substratum and the object that rests on it, or vice versa, the figure is Adhika. This is also of two types as Adikādheya and Adhikādhāra.

In the example given for Adhikādheya [131], it is said that the universe which is the substratum is insufficient for the Ādheya, that is the fame of Pratāparudra. For the second type, the verse "Kvāpi kvāpi kaliṅga mālava" etc., [132] is given as an illustration. Here the substratum is the very big army of Pratāparudra. The armies of other kings which are Ādheya is very small in comparison with the Ādhara.

26 & 27. VIBHĀVANA & VIŚEṢOKTI :

If an effect takes place even in the absence of a chief cause, the figure is Vibhāvana. Though there is full equipment of causes, if the effect is not produced, the figure is Viśeṣokti. Vidyānātha illustrates both in a single verse which reads :

'Pratāparudreṇa parājitānām

pratyarthinām vindhyaguhāgatānām I

Tamāmsyarātriṇi samudbhavanti

te jamsighas resvapinodbhavanti' [133] *II*

In this verse, it is said that the chief cause of darkness is night and though the night is absent, still the effect darkness is mentioned. This is a case of the figure Vibhavan. Similarly, though the cause, i.e., day time is present, its effect light is said to be absent. Hence it makes a case for the figure Viśespkti. Thus the two figures Vibhāvana and Viśeṣokti are illustrated in a single verse. One fails to find much difference in the definitions of Vibhāvana among the ancient

writers.[134] But there is a conceptual difference between Ruyyaka and Jagannātha in this regard. While Ruyyaka opines that the basis of the figure Vibhāvana is Atiśayokti,[135] Jagannātha denies this view saying that view saying that Atiśayokti cannot always be found at the root of the figure Vibhāvana. [136]

28. ASANGATI :

If the cause and its effects belong to different places, the figure is Asangati. In the illustrative verse *'Bibhratyurvīdhurām gurvīm'* etc.,[137] it is said that the heads of the tributory kings bowed down while Vīrarudra was bearing the load of the earth. Here, the cause, i.e., bearing the load is with Pratāparudra, and the effect, bending the heads is with the tributory kings. Thus, the cause and effect belong to two different things.

29. VICITRA :

The figure Vicitra occurs where an attempt is made to achieve an end which is unacceptable to the agent. In the illustrated verse [138] it is said that the kings are getting down their elephants in order to ascend them in the presence of Pratāparudra.

30. ANYONYA :

Anyonya is the figure where out of two objects, each is treated as both the producer and the produced. In the illustrative verse it is said that the royal throne and Pratāparudra who ascended it are decorated by each other. Rudraṭa is the first Ālaṅkārika to mention this figure. Vidyānātha's definition is no way different from that of Mammaṭa. [139]

31. VIṢAMA :

This figure is also based on Virodha. There are three types of Viṣama as follows :

i. the occurance of an effect which stands opposite in nature to the cause,

ii. if an undesirable effect ensues from a chosen cause and

iii. asemblege of dissimilar objects.

In the example given for the first type, [140] it is said that the fame which is as white as the moon by the sword which is black in colour. In the illustrative verse given for the second type,[141] it is said that the kings who assembled to defeat Pratāparudra lose their ornaments along with their lives, having been seen by him. In the verse *'Kvabhūpālastādṛgvibhava'* etc., [142] two dissimilar things, namely the nature of the great kings and their presence in the forests are brought together. Hence, this is a case of the third variety of Viṣamālaṅkara.

32. SAMA :

The figure Sama stands as an antithesis for the third variety of Viṣamālaṅkāra (Virūpaghaṭana). The assemblage of things having same nature is the figure Sama. In the example [143] it is said that the erudition of all types and wealth are said to be present in Pratāparudra. Hence this illustrates the figure Sama.

This figure has not been mentioned by any Ālaṅkārika before Mammaṭa. Both the definitions of Mammaṭa and Viśvanātha also have the same spirit with the difference in wording. [144]

33. TULYAYOGITĀ :

Where the similarity is suggested on account of the mention of the common characteristic of things that are either purely contextual or purely non-contextual, the figure is Tulyayogitā. In the illustration *'Bhadrāsanādhyāsini rudradeve'* [145] etc., the fame and the ladies of the enemy kings of Pratāparudra are contextual. The common characteristic is to become pale or white. Hence, this illustrates the first variety of

Tulyayogitā.

To illustrate the second variety, the verse *'Kurmendra pannagadhila'* etc.,[146] has been given. Here, the tortoise, serpent etc., are all non-contextual. The common characteristic is "getting weak". The similarity suggested here is not factual, but incidental.

While Vidyānātha speaks of two varieties in Tulyayogitā basing on contextual and non-contextual, Kumārasvāmin adds two more with a further division of Guṇa and Kriyā.[147]

Though all the Ālaṅkārikas admit this figure, Daṇḍin treats it as "Stutinindā",[148] while Udbhaṭa, Ruyyaka and Vidyādhara contend that "Aupamya" is always implied in Tulyayogitā. Viśvanātha also fall in a line when he says *'Ekadharmābhisambandhaḥ syāttadā Tulyayogita'* [149] Bhāmaha's indispensable condition for the occurence of this figure is the similarity in action in two objects. [150] Mammaṭa speaks of equalisation [151] where as authors like Jagannātha hold that the figure Tulyayogitā is a variety of Dīpaka. [152]

34. DĪPAKA :

Where similarity is suggested on account of a single characteristic attributed to both contextual and noncontextual objects, the figure is

Dīpaka. This is of three types viz., Ādidipaka, Madhyadīpaka and Antadīpaka, basing on the place where the word expressing the common characteristic has been employed. In the example given for the first type, [153] it is said that the Kali age is brought on account of Pratāparudra as the ages Kṛta, Tretā and Dvāpara by Nala, Rāma, and Dharmaja respectively. Since the word expressing common characteristic is employed in the beginning, this verse illustrates the first variety of Dīpaka.

In the following verse [154] it is said that Pratāparudra shines on

account of his fame as ocean by river Ganges etc. As the word expressing the common characteristic is in the middle, it is a case of Madhyadīpaka. Similarly in the verse "Suralokam suranātho" etc.[155] it is said that Pratāparudra protects the human world as Indra etc., the region of heaven etc. Here the word expressing the common characteristic is employed in the end and as such it is an illustration for Antadīpaka.

The sharp contrast between the figures Dīpaka and Tulyayogitā as explained by Ruyyaka is that in Tulyayogitā all things should be either contextual or non-contextual where as in the figure Dīpaka one or more contextual things and one or more non-contextual things may be connected with an attribute.[156]

Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Udbhaṭa, Vāmana and Rudraṭa speak three varieties of the figure Dīpaka based on gender, action and quality (jati, Kriyā and Guṇa).

35. PRATIVASTŪPAMĀ :

Prativastūpamā is the figure where on account of employment of single characteristic in two different sentences similarity is suggested. This is of two kinds Sādharmya and Vaidharmya. In the example given for the Sādharmyamūlaka prativastūpamā, [157] there is the suggestion that Pratāparudra is capable of churning the army of the enemies as the mountain Mandara does the ocean. In the illustrative verse for "Vaidharmya mūlakaprativastūpamā" [158] it is said that Pratāparudra alone is capable of pleasing the people. There is no other person who is capable of pleasing the cakora birds barring the moon. The similarity suggested here is that Pratāparudra is capable of pleasing the people just as the moon is capable of doing the same in the case of cakora birds.

36. DṚṢṬĀNTA :

If the common characteristic is said in two sentences employing Bimbapratibimbabhāva,the figure is Dṛṣṭānta. This is also of two types as above. The first is illustrated in the verse : *'Kṣonīmbibhratubhūbhṛtaḥ Katipaye'* etc.,[159] where in the similarity between Prataparudra and mountain Meru has been suggested through Bimbapratibimbabhāva. The second type is illustrated in the succeeding verse *'Kākatīndra Kṛpādṛṣṭi'* etc.,[160] where in, it is said that prosperity awakens simply by the side glances of Pratāparudra. The lotuses sleep only when the sun does not rise. The similarity suggested here, is, that just as the lotuses blosom by rising of the Sun, so does prosperity rise on account of the side glances of Pratāparudra.

Udbhaṭa is the first Ālaṅkārika to define this figure. According to Viśvantha, Dṛṣṭānta is the reflective representation of a similar attribute.[161]

37 NIDARŚANA :

Nidarśana is the figure where the phenomenon of Bimbapratibimbabhava is suggested on account of the inapplicability of a characteristic both to Upamāna and Upameya. In the illustrative verse *'Riputimira mudasyan ratnasimhāsanasthaḥ'* etc.[162] it is said that Prataparudra bears the resplendence of the Sụn which is not possible. Hence it is to be understood that he bears resplendence similar to that of the Sun. Hence, there is the suggestion of Bimbapratibimbabhāva. In the verse *'Vīrarudra narendrasya yaśo vaisadya sampadaḥ'* etc.,[163] it is said that the beauties of his fame are seen in the mirror of the milky ocean. This is not possible as in the above case similarity is suggested providing scope for Bimbapratibimbabhāva. Sometimes even for prohibition, Bimbapratibimbabhāva is suggested as in the verse *'Kākatīndraviśatkānta'* etc.[164] Hence it is suggested that prior to the release of the beauty of the lilies their feet are having it.

38. VYATIREKA :

Vyatireka is the figure where the Sādhāraṇya is Bhedapradhāna. This is of two kinds basing on the superiority or the inferiority of the Upamāna and the Upameya. In the illustrative verse *'Dināḳṛtiḳumudairdhṛto na rāgaḥ'* etc.,[165] it is said that Pratāparudra is superior to both the Sun and the Moon because he is capable of pleasing both Kuvalaya and Kamala. The words here carry paranomasia. Thus this is a case of Vyatireka supported by the figure Slesa.

39. ŚLEṢA :

It is Śleṣa (paronomasia) where the similarity of sound exists either to the only contextuals or only noncontextuals or both. In the case of only contextuals and only non-contextuals both the noun and adjective become Paronomistic. But in Ubhayaśleṣa adjectives only become Śliṣṭa. In this third variety if both become Śliṣṭas; it would be a case of Śabdaśaktimūladhvani.

Śleṣa is of three types :

i. Kevala prakrta Śleṣa

ii. Kevalaprakṛta Śleṣa and

iii. Ubhayaśleṣa.

In this connection, Vidyānātha quotes Mammaṭa to show that the third variety, where the Viśeṣya part is paronomistic, is a case of Śabdaśaktimūladhvani.[166]

To illustrate the first variety Vidyānātha composes the verse *'Rajnāḥpūjāvidhim dhatte'* etc.,[167] Here, both Śiva and Viṣṇu are contextual. The second variety finds illustration in the verse *'Sadṛśaḥ Kākatīndroyam'* etc [168]. Here the mountains ana the kings like

Hariścandra are both non-contextual. In the verse *'Vijitāripuro mūrtau'* etc. [169] One finds the third variety illustrated. Here, the king Pratāparudra is contextual and lord Śiva is non-contextual.

40. PARIKARA :

Parikara is the figure where the attributes are significant. The verse "Rājño yādavavaṁśapārthivamaneḥ" etc., [170] is the illustration. Here, the words 'Rājñaḥ' etc., are significant as they are used derogatively.

41. ĀKṢEPA :

In order to suggest a particular idea if a statement made or to be made is apparently prohibited, the figure is Ākṣepa. This is of four types. In the case of a statement made, the prohibition of an object is optionally made. This is first variety. In the second when a statement has to be made it is prohibited. Here arise two varieties.

i. after making a general statement, there is prohibition of a special case and

ii. the part of a statement is made and the other part is prohibited.

The verse "Narendra maule na vayam tava" etc., [171] illustrates the first variety. Here the messagers' statement that they are not messengers involved prohibition. This prohibition is apparent and suggest the idea that all the kings deserve to be protected as servants. To illustrate the second, the verse *'Vayamaśaraṇā ityeṣoktiḥ'* etc.,[172] is given. Here too, the denial of the statement made is apparent and suggests the idea that they should be protected at all costs *'Vijñāpayāmaste Kiṁcit'* etc.,[173] is the verse to illustrate the third variety. Here, a general statement is made and there is the apparent prohibition of a particular statement. The fourth variety is seen illustrated in the verse "Pratāparudra svayamiddhateja" etc.,[174]. Here a part of the statement desired to be

made is expressed and the other part is prohibited. This suggests that the enemy kings should not oppose the king Pratāparudra.

A different concept has been labelled by Ālaṅkārikas as the Ākṣepa. The concept is as follows :

If the prohibition of what is desired is expressed, it becomes apparent. Similarly, the prescription of what is undesirable is also apparent. These two concepts come under the figure Ākṣepa. In the verse "Nātha. Pratāparudrasya sevāṁ tyajasi" etc.,[175] what is undesirable is prescribed. Hence, the prescription is apparent.

42. VYĀJASTUTI :

Either rebuke through expressed praise or a prise through rebuke - these two are the varieties of Vyājastuti. This of two types :

i. nindāstuti and

ii. stutinindā.

In the example given for the first type, [176] it is said "The blackness in the faces of enemies is still there, why to boast that the fame of Pratāparudra has made all things white?" In the succeeding verse[177] the second type is illustrated. In illustrating the second type the verse seems to praise the enemies but it results in their rebuke.

43. APRASTUTAPRAŚAṀSĀ :

If a contextual thing is suggested through the expression of non-contextual, through the relationship of similarity etc., it is a case of Aprastutapraśaṁsā. There are three bases for this figure :

i. Sārupya,

ii. Sāmanyaviśeṣabhāva and

iii. Kāryakāraṇabhāva.

The first is illustrated in the verse *'Āśāsu praśa-mitavasanodayebhyaḥ'* etc., [178] Here, the non-contextual description of the bee suggests the contextual idea related to Pratāparudra. The second however, is illustrated in the verse "Yaśasvinī padmabhavasya" etc.[179] Here, while Pratāparudra was to be described the creation of the creator in general is mentioned. The verse "Draṣṭumanā api napaśyati" etc., [180] also comes under the second type. Here the behaviour of young ladies is contextual, which is suggested through the description of a particular lady. In the verse, *'Gāḍhā ivārṇavā jātā'* etc. [181] from the effect described, there is the suggestion of the cause. In the verse *'Pratāparudranṛpaterdharitrī kalpaśākhinaḥ'* etc., [182] reverse is the case as there is the suggestion of the effect from the description of a cause.

44. PARYAYOKTI :

If the contextual cause is suggested through the description of contextual effect, the figure is Paryāyokti. In the illustrative verse "Pratibhūpālasuddhāntadīrghikā" [183] etc., it is said that the soldiers of Pratāparudra are enjoying a bath in the wells of enemy kings. By this description, it is suggested that the enemies have fled away at the very sight of the army of the enemies, both the things are contextual.

45 PRATĪPA :

The figure Pratīpa occurs where the Upamāna is treated with derision. It also occurs where the Upamāna is treated as the Upameya. The first variety is illustrated in the verse *'Kīrtau pratāparudrasya vilasantyam digambare'* etc. [184] Here the censure of the moon results in the praise of the fame of Pratāparudra. The second is illustrated in the verse - *'Kākatīyakule lakṣmīpatireṣā'* etc.[185] Here the mountain Sumeru is treated as Upameya and hence this too forms as

an illustration for Pratīpa.

46. ANUMĀNA :

This is a figure based on the science of Tarka. Where there is the narration of Sādhana and Sādhya the figure is Anumāna. In the illustrative verse *'Rajodhūmaḥ senāvyatikarabhavo'* etc.,[186] the smoke of the form of dust and the sparks of fire are the Hetu. The fire of anger is inferred.

47. KĀVYALIṄGA :

If the cause is expressed either in the sentence or a word, the figure is Kāvyaliṅga. This is of two types :

i. Vākyārthahetuka and

ii. Padārthahetuka

According to Ruyyaka the word Kāvyaliṅga has nothing to do with the liṅga of Indian logic (Hetu). Therefore, in this there will not be any material such as Vyāpti, Pakṣadharmatā etc., That is why it differs from Anumāna.

48. ARTHĀNTARANYASA :

Arthāntaranyāsa is the figure where cause, effect the generic and the specific happen to support one another. In the verse *'Bhūpaḥ pratāparudrasya natā bhavatā'* etc.,[187] there is a case where the efect supports the cause. Here Kumārasvāmin observes that though there is the contingency of Kāryakāraṇabhāva in both Arthantaranyāsa and Kāvyaliṅga, in Kāvyaliṅga there is the anticipation of the cause to support the effect. In Arthāntaranyāsa, however, the cause mentioned is rather an indifferent one. Hence the difference between the two figures.

In the verse *'Udvejitā rudranareśvarasya'* etc., [188] a specific case has been supported by a generic one. Just the reverse takes place in the verse *'Duṣṭo'pi mahatāṁ saṅgādbhavatyeva'* etc.[189] In the case where the cause defends the effect, Kāvyaliṅga is the figure. Hence, there are only three varieties of Arthāntaranyāsa.

This is one of the most famous figures. Beginning with Bhāmaha all most all the Ālaṅkārikas have defined this figure. Bhāmaha achieves precision in saying that it is the utterance of a meaning different from the context. [190] According to Daṇḍin, Arthāntaranyāsa occurs in the case of the description of a particular thing, for which different meaning may be attributed. Such an attribution may be universal or special. [191]

The scope of the figure Arthāntaranyāsa is different from that of Dṛṣṭānta where a general statement is supported by a general one and a particular by a particular one. This can neither be included in Aprastutapraśaṁsā, for, the general and particular propositions are expressly mentioned in Arthāntaranyāsa while in Aprastutapraśaṁsā, the general is expressly mentioned and the general or the particular are to be implied. Mammaṭa speaks of four varieties of this figure. Viśvanātha offers a more elaborate definition following Ruyyaka.[192]

49. YATHĀSAṄKHYA :

The figure Yathāsaṅkhya is based on Vākyanyāya. The definition given by Vidyānātha is as follows :

When certain things are spoken of in a particular order and if the same order is followed, when their predicates follow the same order the figure is Yathāsaṅkhya. In the illustration *'Gāmbhīryamaunnatyamanargalatvam'* etc.,[193] the figure is seen illustrated.

50. ARTHĀPATTI :

The mention of a particular thing if invariable supposes another which is unexpressed the figure is Arthāpatti. In the verse *'Samantādudvelaiḥ'* etc.,[194] the figure is seen illustrated. Kumārasvāmin in this context speaks of 'Daṇḍāpūpikānyāya' meaning that when the Daṇḍa or the stick itself is consumed special mention is not required that the sweet meat is also consumed.

51. PARISAṄKHYĀ :

When a particular thing has relationship with many things at a time and if its relationship is restricted to a particular case the figure is 'Parisaṅkhyā'.

This is of two types viz., Praśnapūrvikā and Apraśnapūrvikā. Again it has two more types Arthvarjanitya and Śabdavarjaniya. Thus Parisaṅkhyā has four varieties in total.

Of the examples given for this figure, in the first illustration [195] it is said that though Pratāparudra and mountain Meru are the factors that embellish the world, the mountain Meru has been avoided of being the embellishing factor which results in saying that Pratāparudra is the only one who can embellish the world. So this is a case of Śabdavarjaniya Praśnapūrvikā Parisaṅkhyā.

In this second one, the moon light has been implicitly denied as the silk canopy of the world and the fame of Pratāparudra is spoken as such. Similarly the elephants of the cardinal points are not accepted as the happy abode of the earth. The arms of Pratāparudra are spoken as such. Hence the second variety of the figure.

In the case of 'Apraśnapūrvikā Śabdavarjanīyā', the cessation of the materialistic pleasures are expressed and for the last variety the question is not indicated and the idea to be conveyed is expressed.

Ruyyaka in his Alaṅkāra Sarvasva speaks that when this Parisaṅkhyā is said with Śliṣṭapada, it will be all the more beautiful.[196] So Vidyānātha also follows him and illustrates it in the verse *'Kṣoṇīm Rudranareśvare'* etc.

52. UTTARA :

If a question is assumed by the answer or the questions and the answers in plenty are mentioned the figure is Uttara. It is of two types: i. Where the question is imaginable by the way in which the answer is stated;

ii. Where the series of questions and answers are given.

In the illustration of the first type[197] it is stated "Don't you know that as soon as Pratāparudra is coronated to the throne Dharma has been established". The probable questions posed may be imagined as "Is there the proper rule in the kingdom of Pratāparudra"? and "Are Brāhmins safe in his rule?" In the second variety as series of questions and answers are arranged.

53. VIKALPA :

When there are two statement of equal strength option results and this is the figure Vikalpa. In the illustrative verse[198] it is said that the tributary kings who have tasted the valour of king Pratāparudra are saying to their collegues either to bend either their bows or heads. Bending the bow is to show their self respect. Bowing the head is to signify their obedience. Both the acts cannot take place at a time. So the choice has been left for them between these two acts and as such this is a case of Vikalpa.

54. SAMUCCAYA :

The simultaneity or qualities and actions is the figure Samuccaya. In order to illustrate the simultaneity of qualities Vidyānātha presents

the verse *'Pratāparudranṛpatau'* [199]etc. Here the qualities Prasannatva and Kaluṣatva are simultaneously presented.

In the verse *'Prekṣate imam Narendra'* etc., there is simultaneity of actions. The verse *'Trailokya Prathamānakīrti'* etc.,[200] simultaneity of action is presented in a single substratum i.e., the women of the enemy kings. Similarly the verse "Deve Kākatīvīrarudranṛpatau" [201] etc., presents a case where there is simultaneity of qualities in a single substratum.

b. DVITĪYA SAMUCCAYA :

In the figure Dvitīya Samuccaya there is assemblege of many causes that are engaged in the accomplishment of a particular action. In the verse *'Subhram yaśaḥ sauryamahacca'* [202] etc., the causes fame etc.,[199] go to establish the unique greatness of the king Pratāparudra. Hence the figure.

55. SAMĀDHI :

When a particular cause is about to achieve a particular effect, if another helps incidentally the figure is Samādhi. In the illustration *'Raṇāṅgaṇe rudranarendraroṣa'* etc., [203] the fall of grass in the mouths of enemy kings has helped the production of the effect namely cessation of anger.

56. BHĀVIKA :

Bhāvika is the figure where the description of a wonderful situation presents the things belonging to past and future are made to appear as belonging to the present. A question has been raised by Kumārasvāmin as to how the things of past and future can be shown as belonging to the present. The answer here is that it is a matter of contemplation which is capable of bringing about the things of past and future within the realm of sense perception. This is something like

a traveller on account of his intense contemplation visualises his beloved in tangible form.

Bhāvika is neither Svabhāvokti as the figure Svabhāvokti involves descriptions without any omission or commission. In the figure the description of Atyadbhuta is present. So Bhāvika and Svabhāvokti have different scopes.

This is nor the figure Rasavat, because in Rasavat there is the brooding over the equipment Vibhāva etc. As there is no Adhyavaśāna, this cannot by utprekṣā, nor this iś Bhrāntimat because contemplation is not the same as delusion.

57. PRATYANĪKA :

Pratyanīka is the figure where somebody related to the opponent is insulted as the opponent himself could not be revenged powerful as he is. In the illustration "Kākatīyapatisaurya" etc., the Badaba fire being incapable of meeting the valour of Pratāparudra inflicts pain on the ocean that holds similarity to the valour of Pratāparudra.

58. VYĀGHĀTA :

Vyāghāta is the figure where a particular thing acomplished with a particular agent is undone by another agent with the same instrument. Though Rudraṭa is the first Ālaṅkārika to define this figure,[204] one can see a more scientific treatment of the definition at the hands of Mammaṭa.[205]

In this illustration "Kākatīyabhijñātoyam nābhijātā"[206] etc., it is said that Pratāparudra subdued the very enemy kings with his hands who were born from the hands of Brahman.

59. PARYĀYA :

If a single object happens to reside in many substrata one after

another, the figure designated as the first type of paryāya. The second, however, occurs where many things happen to reside in the same substratum. In the illustration *'Damṣṭrāyam Kuhanakiṭerbhagavato'* etc.[207] the same earth is said to reside first on the tooth of the premeaval pig, next on the host of the hoods of Adiśeṣa, and finally in Kaliyuga, it rests on the arm of Pratāparudra.

In the illustration "Yeṣam mukhe nijavadhūsavidhe" etc.[208], in the substratum, i.e., the mouth of the enemy kings, two things are said to reside one after another. First, words suggestive of valour and then, words suggestive of dejection and misery.

60. SŪKṢMA :

Sūkṣma is the figure where an idea othersise undiscernable is disclosed. In the illustration "Gurujanasavidhe vadhūdṛṣṭvā" etc.,[209] it is said that a lady while staying in the presence of elders sees the messenger sent by the king. To convey her intention she besmears her body with musk.

61. UDĀTTA :

The description of the things in abundance is the figure Udātta. In the illustration *'Ramyamekaśilābhidhānanagarī'* etc.,[210] it is said that the scholars residing in the capital of Pratāparudra were living in golden houses and were witnessing their children playing with young elephants.

Ruyyaka opines that the descrition of great personalities also comes under this type.[211] Thus Udātta becomes two-fold according to him. Here Kumārasvāmin quotes Ānandavardhana and tells that this second variety of Udātta is not acceptable to Vidyānātha.[212]

62. PARIVṚTTI :

The figure Parivṛtti as explained by Vidyānātha is of three types.

i. Samaparivṛtti

ii. Nyūnaparivṛtti and

iii. Adhikaparivṛtti.

The first occurs where a thing is bartered for another of equal value. The second occurs where an object of less value is bartered for a thing which is of higher value. The third occurs where an object of high value is bartered for an object of low value.

The verse *'Sudhārasamucovaco'* etc. [213] illustrates the first variety. Here, the words of poets and the elephants are of equal value. In the second illustration "Upāyanam gajāsvādi" etc., [214] the presents offered by the tributory kings are of less value than the pleasing sight of Pratāparudra. The verse *'Pratāparudreṇa raṇe jitāḥ'* etc. [215] illustrates the third variety. Here, the ornaments offered by the ladies of the enemy-kings are of high value when compared with the bark ornaments received by them.

63. KĀRAṆAMĀLĀ :

If the things that are formally described happen to be the effects of the things that come latter, the figure is Kāraṇamālā. The illustration is "Vidyayā vinayo tkarṣo" etc. [216] Here, Vidyā or the instruction is the cause for humility. Humility is again the cause for the acquisition of good qualities. The qualities again are the cause for the love of the people.

64. EKĀVALĪ :

Ekāvalī is the figure where the thing formerly said is qualified by a thing latter mentioned. The illustration *'Pratāparudranagarī'* etc., [217] illustrates the figure.

65. MĀLĀDĪPAKA :

When the things that are mentioned first happen to be superior to the things mentioned latter, the figure is Mālādīpaka. In the verse *'Bhāgyabhūmā mahīṁ prāptaḥ'* etc.,[218] the same is illustrated.

66. SĀRA :

The anti-thesis of Mālādīpaka, i.e., if the thing described latter is greater than the former one, the figure is Sāra. In the illustration "Jagatsu vasudhā bhāti" [219] etc., the things that are mentioned latter happen to be superior to those mentioned earlier.

CHAPTER - IX

MIŚRĀLAṄKĀRAPRAKARAṆA

SAṀSṚṢṬI AND SAṄKARA :

The figures get mixed up basing on two relations i.e., Saṁyoga and Samavāya. Thus Miśrālaṅkāras are generally two types. The mingling of such figures like that of Sesamum and rice (Tilataṇḍula) is one, and that milk and water (Kṣīranīra) is the second. The figure that occurs by the relationship of Saṁyoga is Saṁsṛṣṭi while the second is called Saṅkara.

Saṁsṛṣṭi is of three types :

1. Where the figures based on sound are involved

2. Where the figures based on sense are involved and

3. Where the figures based on sound and sense are involved.

The verse *'Sumbhatsambhrama gandha sindhura'* etc., [1] which illustrates the case where Chekānuprāsa and Vṛttyanuprasa-both Śabdālaṅ-kāras are involved, stands as an example for the first type of Saṁsṛṣṭi. For the second type of Saṁsṛṣṭi *'Kākatīndra camūrdhatte'* etc., [2] is the illustration. "Pratāparudra dordaṇḍo maṇḍalāgreṇa" etc.[3] the figures Vṛttyanuprāsa and Upmā based on sound and sense are involved.

Saṅkara is also of three types as follows :

1. Aṅgāṅgibhāva saṅkara,

2. Sandeha saṅkara and

3. Ekavācakānu-praveśa saṅkara.

In the verse *'Udyadbṛṁhita garjitaiḥ'* etc.,[4] the first variety of Saṅkara is illustrated. Here, the figure Upamā (pravṛdvihara iva) is

prominent. The second Upamā (dvīpaghaṭe Kādambinī) is ancillary. Hence there is Aṅgāṅgibhāva for two figures of Upamā.

In the verse *'Pratāparudrasya kṛpāṇadhra'* etc.,[5] two different figures Utprekṣā and Rūpaka are involved. To illustrate Ekavacakānupraveśa saṅkara, Vidyānātha composes the verse "Vijitāripuro murtau" etc.,[6] here, two figures Upamā and Śleṣa happen to get construed with the single term 'iva'.

To illustrate Sandeha saṅkara, Vidyānātha mentions the verse *'Jātaḥ pratāparudrenduḥ'* etc. Here there is doubt whether the figure here employed is Rūpaka or Upamā. Grammar allows both the cases to be present. Hence doubt. If there is a bādhakaprakaraṇa, there arises no doubt. For instance, in the verse *'Pratāparudranṛpateḥ pārijātāt'* etc.,[7] there is clear indication for Rūpaka. When there is Bādhakapramāṇa, there too, cannot be any doubt. In the verse, *'Kākatīndrasya niḥ sāṇadhvanau'*[8] etc., there cannot be Upamā since according to the aphorism "Upamitam Vyaghrādibhiḥ" etc., there is sāmānyaprayoga. Where there is sāmānyaprayoga there one cannot speak of Upamā. Hence, Rūpaka is only to be accepted.

While concluding, Vidyānātha shows different designs of poetry like Padma bandha and Cakrabandha.

VIDYĀNĀTHA AS A POET

In this chapter, some selective verses of Vidyānātha, carrying literary excellence have been studied and their beauties are presented. Vidyānātha is a poet of no mean order and whatever idea he presents, he presents it in such a lucid and pleasing manner that the readers attention is atonce glued to it. To begin with, Vidyānātha eulogises Sarasvati, the goddess of learning. The verse runs as follows :

"Vidyākairavakaumudīṁ śrutiśirahsīmanta muktāmaṇim

dārān padmabhuvastrilokajananīṁ vande girāṁ devatam I

yatpādābjanamaskriyāḥ sukṛtināṁ sārasvataprakriyā-

bījanyāsabhuvo bhavanti kavitānāṭyaikajīvātavaḥ II [1]

"I salute the consort of the lotus-born, the mother of the three worlds, who is the moon-light for the lilies of learning. She is the pearl of the heads of the Vedas, i.e., the Upaniṣads. The salutations made to her by the learned scholars are the fields for sowing the seed of the literary activity. Again, they are the life-tonics for the art of Poetry".

From this benedictory verse, it is known that out of the three factors, Pratibhā, Vyutpatti and Kāvyakāraṇābhyāsa, the first occupies the most important place, without which Poetry cannot be composed and though composed, becomes an object of ridicule. The word 'Bīja' here, stands for the Pratibhā or talent of the poet.

While speaking about the resplendence (Tejasvitā), one of the qualities of the Nāyaka, Vidyānātha gives the following verse as an illustration :

"Sada tejobhānau sphurati jayinaḥ Kākativibho -

rarikṣmābhṛtkāntācikuratimirāhamkṛtimuṣi I

prakāśavyutpattirbhavati jaraduddāmatamasā -

masūryāmpasyānāmavadhigiripāscātyadṛsadām' II [2]

"When the Sun-like valour of Pratāparudra is shining, there is light extended even to the eastern slopes of the extreme mountains which are steeped in darkness. The very same Sun steals away the pride of the darkness of the locks of hair of the ladies of the enemy-kings."

. Here, the idea that the valour of Pratāparudra has extended itself to the western parts of the extreme mountains is beautifully suggested.

'Dharmālambasamucchritāṁ tribhuvanasyai kātapatraśriyaṁ

dhatte kākatīvīrarudranṛpateḥ sphūram yaśomaṇḍalam I

Chayevāsya nabhaḥsthalīkuvalayasyāmeyamālokyate

tan manye niyatam pratāpatapanastasyopari dyotate' II [3]

is the verse given as an illustration for yasaḥpratāpasubhagatva which would mean -

"The domain of the fame of Pratāparudra holds the charm of the unbrella of the three worlds. It is extended taking the support of Dharma. The blue sky is its shade. Therefore, I presume that the Sun of his valour, indeed, must be shining above".

Here, the imagery of the poet has almost touched the fringes of extremities. He has given fullest scope for both valour and fame of Pratāparudra.

In Kāvyaprakaraṇa, while illustrating the Ārabhaṭīvṛtti, Vidyānātha composes the following verse which depicts the sentiment Bībhatsa :

'Khaḍgāghāta nikṛttaśātravaśiro niṣṭhyūta raktacchaṭā

jvālairudbhaṭa śastraghaṭṭana bhavatsphāra sphuliṅgotkaraiḥ I

styānāsṛkpiśitāsthikhaṇḍa vikaṭā sthūlojjvalāṅgarakai-

ruccaṇḍaścalamartigaṇḍa nṛpateḥ krodhāgnirāyodhane' [4] II

"On account of streams of blood oozing out from the heads of the enemy-kings, sparks of fire generated due to the clash of weapons and the burning coal in the form of flesh and clotted blood, the fire of anger of Pratāparudra is very furious".

Here, the employment of hard sounds is very conducive for the Ārabhaṭīvṛtti, the poet has chosen to illustrate. Added to this, there is ample suggestion of the two sentiments Raudra and Bībhatsa. They are subservient to the reverential feelings the poet has for his patron.

The illustration of Sāttvatīvṛtti is again beautiful when he says -

'Dūrādākarṇya viśvaprasṛmara mahaso vīrarudrasya jaitra -

prasthānārambha bherīninada marinṛpāḥ pūrṇakarṇajvarārtāḥ I

Āruhyadrīn viśanto gahanamatimahatkaṇṭakākṛsta keśa

strāyadhvam muñcateti pratinṛpatidhiyā pādapānprārthayante' II

Here, the panic-stricken enemy kings of Pratāparudra having heard the war-drums flee into the forests with ears full of fear. While hurriedly passing through the forest, their hair was caught by the thorny bushes and mistaking the bushes for the soldiers of Pratāparudra, they pray for release and protection.

Here, the fear of the enemy-kings has been well described. The saying -

'Bhītasya nūnam bhayakāri sarvam' has been well illustrated in this verse.

The illustrative verse for the Gauḍīrīti can be reckoned as an illustrious one :

'Udyaddoḥstambha khaḍga truṭadarimakuṭāṭopa saṃjātarāhu

bhrānti bhraśyatpataṅga bhayakaraṇa caṇa sphāranāśira reṇuḥ I

āndhrakṣmābhartu rāśīdadhikaraṇadhurā bhīma mattebhakumbha

prodyanmuktaugha tārā prakaraparivṛta ssvarvadhūvaktra candra'

Here, the war-field of Pratāparudra has been well described. The dust that has arisen has covered the disc of the Sun as it were to protect it from Rāhu, of the form of heads that are chopped off by the sword of Pratāparudra. Again the pearls that sprung from the broken heads of the elephants were like so many stars. The faces of the divine nymphs were like moons.

This verse illustrating the Rīti, Gauḍīya, has both the characteristics of Ojas and Kānti. The imagery is simply superb as it presents the war-field as night beautified by moon and stars.

The very next verse also stands as an example for the heights of Vidyānātha's imagery which runs as follows :

'Jetuḥ kākati vīrarudranṛpaterjaitraprayāṇotthite

Kṣoṇīreṇubhareṇabhasyati bhṛśaṁ bhūvibhramam bibhrati I

jatāmartyanadī viśaṁkaṭa taṭīdīrghā viyaddīrghikā

gāḍham gūḍhatamā ca gautamanadī pātālagaṅgāyate' II [7]

It is an acknowledged poetic fancy that the river Ganges resides in three worlds i.e., the heaven, the earth and the nether regions (Pātāla). It has three names basing upon its residence as Mandākinī, Bhāgīrathī and Bhogāvatī respectively. In this verse, Vidyānātha presents a fine imagery that the Mandākinī i.e., the Ganges residing in the heaven has become Bhāgīrathī. This is on account of the sky becoming the earth as the dust on the earth has risen, due to the marching of the soldiers of Pratāparudra who have started for an invasion, and pervaded the whole sky. So the sky looks like earth and the Mandākinī which resides there becomes Bhāgīrathi. Hence, Bhāgīrathī in its turn look like Pātālagaṅga (Bhogāvatī).

The verse that depicts Nārikelapāka is also one of the finest pieces of Vidyānātha that pleases the minds of the aesthetes.

'Līlā vibhramapūrvaraṅgamuditam tāruṇyametya trapā

nepathyāntara bimbita smarakalā lāsyaprapañcaśriyaḥ I

sakhyaḥ paśyata kākatīyanṛpatau bhāvānu bandhojjvalaḥ

Ko 'pyasyāstaralabhruvo vijayate śṛṅgāra nāṭyakramaḥ II

The description of a heroine who can be designated as Madhyā is made in this verse. The feelings of the erotics of the heroine regarding Pratāparudra have been well described here. Her youth is the preparatory ground for her charming gestures. The beauties of her charm are partly seen through the veil of bashfulness. The metaphor employed here, is highly conducive to the present sentiment Śṛṅgāra.

Speaking of the different Kāvya varieties, Vidyānātha composes a Prākṛt verse "Khagge jujjha vijumbhi" etc., in order to illustrate Arthacitra. The Sanskrit shade of this verse is as follows :

'Khaḍge Yuddhavijṛmbhite ripumahīnāthāñjalim bimbitam

prekṣanto jayalakṣmivāsa kamalam manyante vijñāninaḥ I

manye vīrapratāparudravibhorjanyeṣu grāhitum punaḥ

sṛṣṭyai ripujīvitāni vidheryātasya pīṭāmbujam II [9]

The scholars having seen the reflection of the palms of the enemy-kings in the sword of Pratāparudra take it as the lotus seat of the gooddess of victory. The poet, however, opines that it is the lotus seat of the creator who came to collect the lives of the enemy-kings in order to create them again.

This verse has been given as an illustration for 'Arthacitra' as has been already mentioned. The figure here is Apahnuti according to the definition -

'Niṣiddhya viṣayam sāmyādanyāropehyapahnutiḥ'

The idea conceived by the poet in 'this verse is full of poetic imagery.

In the Nāṭakaprakaraṇa, the drama which has been given as an illustration of the theory part contains the verse -

'Lokālokagirīndrakandaratamassandoha darpāpaham

tvattejaḥ paṭalam kūyanti bhuvananyakrāmya samkrīḍate I

ityālokanakautukīva sithila svīyādhikārāśramo

bhāsvaneṣa samagra dīptiradhunā vyomagramārohati' II [10]

Here, the Sun has been fancied as an observer who wishes to visualise the spread of the valour of Pratāparudra in different regions. Apart from the charm of the figure Utprekṣā, the composition of the words is so friendly that it provides a beautiful illustration for Śayyā which Vidyānātha defines as -

'Yā padānām parā anyonya maitrī śayyeti kathyate'

Here and there, the charm of Vṛttyanuprāsa also enhances the beauty of the verse.

Coming to Rasaprakaraṇa, one finds the following verse which has been given as an illustration for one of the transient moods 'Jaḍatā'

'Samāyāte nāthe pramahasi gṛhān rudranṛpatau

vapussaundaryaśrī vijita madanodāra yaśasi I

vadhūrantastoṣa vyatikara vaśannopa caritum

purastādālīnām na calati tatha no viramati' II [11]

The statement *'Purastādālīnām na calati tathā no viramati'* brings out clearly the very nature of Jaḍatā. Similar is the description in the Kumārasambhava where Kālidāsa describes the same mood in the case of Pārvati. He observes :

'Margācalavyatikarā kuliteva sindhuḥ

sailādhirājatanayā na yayau na tasthau' [12]

"Rahaḥ pratyāsanne hṛdayadayite rudranṛpatau

nivṛttā mānājñā viralāmpi lajjivilasitam

kimanyatte gopyam bahirabahirānandamasṛṇaḥ

smarāveśaḥ kopi priyasakhi nṛpeṇaikayati mām" II[13]

In this verse the behaviour of a heroine with the hero has been well described. The intensity of their love is well brought out in the statement -

'Bahirabahirānandamasṛṇaḥ smarāveśaḥ Kopi priyasakhi nṛpenaikayati mām'.

This reminds us of the verse composed by Bhartṛhari in his Śṛṅgāraśataka -

'Adarśane darśanamātrakāma dṛṣṭvā pariṣvaṅga rasaikalola I

Āliṅgitāyām punarāyatākṣyāmāśāsmahe vigrahayorabhedam' II[14]

'Pasyantyātmaja darśamindu mamarā śrotasvinim satsakhi -

darśam kṣīrapayonidhim priyasuhṛddarśam girim rājatam I

līlādarpaṇadarśa manyadamalam tārādi hārāvalī

darśam khelati vīrarudranṛpateḥ kīrtirjagadvyāpinī' II[15]

In the above verse, the activity of the fame of Pratāparudra has been well presented and it involves the technicalities of grammar. Most of the earlier writers have avoided treating Luptopamas based on grammatical peculiarities. Though Vidyānātha illustrates all the nineteen varieties of Luptopama with the technicalities of grammar, the verses are charming because of their being very lucid. The above illustration is a typical instance.

'Brahman] merugirau kṛtepi kimidam naivam vidhāste mudaḥ

svaminsatyamadhikriyādya phalitā yadvīrarudraḥ kṛtaḥ I

mithyā kiṁ nu vikathase trijagatastrāṇāya matprārthitaḥ

sambhuḥ kṣmā mavatīrṇa vāniti kathā jātā haribrahmaṇoḥ' II[16]

This verse has been given to illustrate one of the varieties of Atiśayokti, namely 'Asambandhe sambandha'. Here, the conversation as presented between Viṣṇu and Brahman is quite interesting and brings out how a poetic genius can make even an insipid idea very interesting.

In the verse -

'Kṣoṇiṁ bibhratu bhūbhṛtaḥ katipaye kāpi pratiṣṭhāpunaḥ

svarṇādrerdigadhīśa vāsa nagarī sandhigdha kuñja śriyaḥ I

rājānau janarañjanaṁ vidadhatāṁ śrīvīrarudraprabhoḥ

Ko 'pyanyo mahimā jagattrayadhurādhaureya dośśālinaḥ' II [17]

Bimbapratibimbabhāva is presented. This is a phenomenon where two objects lacking similarity between themselves are compared basing the simlarity of objects related to them.

'Vastutaḥ bhinnayorapi upamānopameyadharmayoḥ

parasparasādṛsyāt abhinnatayā adhyavasitayoḥ

dvirūpādānaṁ bimbapratibimbabhāvaḥ ' [18]

On account of this phenomenon, the similiarity between Pratāparudra and mountain Meru is well brought out.

CONCLUSION

The Pratāparudrīyo as has, already been mentioned is a Prakaraṇa text dealing with all the topics in Alaṅkāraśāstra in a lucid way. It is exclusively meant for a beginner and presents all the ideas in a clear way. The commentary of Kumārasvāmisomapīthin here and there enters into deeper discussions throwing further light on the subject. In this thesis, an attempt has been made to focus the different aspects of the subject, bringing to light the issues where Vidyānātha differs from his predecessors. One important asset for the work is that it has very beatufiful illustrative verses, bringing out clearly the concept of the technicalities of the science. The differences he indulged in have been logically explained and a way out has been suggested. As far as possible the views of earlier writers also have studied while explaining the stand of Vidyānātha. No point occuring in the text has been avoided. Thus this thesis projects the talents of Vidyānātha as a poet and a critic.

FOOT NOTES

CHAPTER - I

1. P.R., Kum., p.12
2. P.R., I-11
3. Rud., Kav., XII - 7, 8
4. S.T., I-27
5. S.K.A., V-122-3
6. Hem. Kav., VII-2
7. Vag. Al., V-7
8. Vag. Kav., V-p. 62
9. A.S., VIII-I-8.
10. D.R., II-I-2.
11. S.D., III-30
12. R.S., I. 61-63
13. S.S., IV. 42-43
14. Al. San., IV. 1-3.
15. Cited in L.S.D., p. 204
16. N.D., IV - 7, 8
17. AC. SS. XI-2
18. N.S. XXXIV. 18-19
19. P.R. Kum., pp. 13-14.
20. P.R., p.16
21. Ibid
22. "Atha sambharitanayakasamanyagunayogini nayiketi ...." P.R., Kum., p. 19.
23. "Svadhinapatika ... khanditaceti strinamastavasthah" Vag Kav., p. 63.
24. S.K., V. 110-120.
25. Ibid.

27. N.S., XXIV-207

28. D.R., II-24

29. P.R., I-43

30. S.D., III-74; S.T., I-133; Hem. Kav. Vii.30, 173; Vag., Kav., p.63; R.M., p.163; R.S., I-150; S.S., IV-23; A.S., IV-36.

31. N.S., XXIV-205; D.R., II-24; S.D., III-85;

32. S.T., I-137; B.P., IV-242

33. "Svatmanani vesmaca harsena bhusayatyesyati priye Visakasajja" D.R., p.106.

34. P.R., p.20.

35. N.S., XXIV-206

36. D.R., II-25

37. P.R., I-47

38. N.S., XXIV-210

39. D.R., II-26

40. S.T., I-141

41. P.R., I-49

42. N.S., XXIV-209

43. S.T., I-43

44. D.R., II-25

45. "Kupita Khanditamata", P.R. I-49

46. P.R., I-51

47. N.S. XXIV-208; S.D., III-82; S.T., I-139; Hem. Kav., p.419, R.M., p.125; D.R., II-26; R.S., I-132, 33; S.S., IV-24; A.S., IV-37.

48. P.R., I-53; N.S., XXIV-211; D.R., II-27; S.T., I-147; Hem. Kav. p. 418; Vag. Kav., p. 63; R.M., p.108; R.S., I-123; S.S. IV-23; A.S., IV-38; S.D., III-84

49. P.R., p.23

50. N.S., XXIV-212

51. S.T., I-145; Hem. Kav., p.421; Vag. Kav., p.64; R.M., p.171; R.S., I-134; S.S., IV-25; A.S., IV-39, S.D., II-76.

52. B.P., IV-258

53. D.R., II-27

54. P.R., Kum., p.22.

55. S.D., III-77-79

56. R.M., pp. 177-180

57. B.P., IV-273-78

58. R.M., p. 184

59. "Kamasastra prasiddhah padmini citrini prabhrtayo jativisesa jnatavyah", P.R., p. 23.

CHAPTER - II

1. "Adosau Sagunau salankarau sabdarthau kavyamiti kavya samanya laksanam". P.R., p. 29.

2. K.D., 1-7

3. "Nyakkaro hyayameva me yadarayastatrapyasau tapasah so pyatraivanihanti raksasakulam jivatyaho ravanah /

   dhik dhik sakrajitam prabhodhitavata kim kumbhakarnenava Svargagramatikavilunthanavr-dho cchunaih kimebhirbhujaih" /Hanumannataka.

4. P.R., II-2-5.

5. P.R., Kum., p.32

6. P.R., II-6

7. P.R., II-7

8. Cited in A.P.Y., p.85

9. Ibid

10. Ibid

11. K.P.Ch. II.

12. V.V., pp. 15-16

13. R.G.,

14. S.D.,

15. "Gaunavrttirapi laksanaprabheda eva, sambandhanupapatti mulakatvat, yatha agnirmanavaka ityatra agnisadrsyavisista manavaka pratipattirvivaksita tathaiva gangayam ghosa ityatra gangasambandhavisista tirapratipattirvivaksita". P.R., pp. 30-31

16. Ibid., II-12

17. P.R., II-13.

18. P.R., II-14

19. K.P., II-6, p.9.

20. "Tatparyarthopi Vyangyartha eva, napunah prthagbhutah", P.R., p.29.

21. P.R., p:32

22. S.T., I-19, III-52

23. D.R., II-77

24. Ibid

25. Ibid., II-83

26. Ibid., II-88

27. Ibid., II-95

28. N.S., XXII-25

29. Ibid., XXII-38

30. Ibid., XXII-47

31. Ibid., XXII-48

32. P.R., II-15, 16

33. S.K.A., p. 139

34. P.R., II-24

35. Ibid

36. K.D., I-40. Vide Com. of Hemacandratarkavagisa

37. Rud. Kav. p. 10, S.D., p. 468

38. R.A. III-17 39 S.K.A., II-33

40. P.R., p.43

41. P.R., II-4

42. "..... Rasena śayyāṁ svayamabhyupagatā" etc., Kad., p.4 Verse - 8

43. "Śabdālaṅkāramāhustān kāvyamīmāṁsakā viduḥ chāyā mudrā tathoktiśca yuktirgumphanayā saha" "Abhiprāyaviśeṣeṇa kaviśaktiṁ vivṛṇvati mutpradāyinīti sāmudrā saiva śayyāpi no mata" A.P. 342-19 & 25

44. S.K.A., II-54

45. P.R., Dr. Raghavan's Introduction, p.19.

46. P.R., p.45

47. Ibid.

48. P.R., Dr. Raghavan's Introduction, p. 19.

49. Ekāvalī, p. 21

50. C.C., p. 151

51. P.R., II-35

52. Ibid., p.45

53. C.C., IV-38

54. Ka. Su., 7

55. Ibid., p.11

56. S.K.A., V-123

57. K.M., p. 20

58. Eka., p.p. 18-19

59. P.R., p.45

60. Ibid., p.46

61. Ibid., II-38

62. P.R., II-39

63. Kira

64. P.R., II-40

65. P.R., II-41

66. Ibid., II-42

67. Ibid., Kum., p. 49

68. "Citrasadrsyat, ascarya hetutvadva citram", K.S., V-12

69. R.A., III-52

70. Mentioned in A.P.Y., p.144

71. Dhva ·

72.

73. P.R., Kum., pp. 52-53

74. "Agūḍha maparasyāṅgaṁ vācyasiddhyaṅga masphuṭaml
Sandhigdha tulyapradhānye kākvākṣiptamasundaram" II
P.R., p.60; (K.P., V-45)

75. K.D., I-16, 17

76. "Astasargannaca nyunam trimsatsargacca nadhikam
Mahakavyam prayoktavyam mahapurusa kirtiyuk"
Isanasamhita (as quoted in APY., p. 158)

77. Nāṭyanta vistāraḥ sargaḥ trimśatova naconatā I
Dviśatyānādhikaṁ kāryam tat padyasyaca
lakṣaṇam II
Ibid.,

78. "Yasmin śrute etc. Ibid

79. "Sargānte bhāvisargasya kathāyāḥ sūcanaṁ
bhavet". SD. VI-32

80. Dr. Raghavan says that Saṅghāta is a classical
name for it. PR., p. 23 Also vide K.D., I-13

81. K.D., I-31

82. "Ākhyāyikoadhvāsādinā vaktrāparavaktrādinā yuktā.
Kathā tu tadvirahitā". Quoted by Kumārasvāmin,
P.R., Kum., p.64

83. "Tatkathākhyāyiketyekā jātiḥ samjñādvayaṅkitā I
Atraivāntarbhaviṣyanti śeṣāścākhyana jātayaḥ II
K.D., I-28

84. "Jayodāharaṇam bahvorgopayāmāsa kinnarān" Raghu. IV-78. "Patreniveśitamudāharaṇaṁ priyāyāḥ" Vikra. II-15.

85. Al. San., XI-47, 48.

CHAPTER - III

1. P.R., p.85
2. D.R., I-10
3. N.S., XXI-1
4. B.P., p.200
5. N.L.R., p.7
6. P.R., Kum., p.68
7. Ibid., pp. 68-69
8. P.R., p.75
9. N.L.R., p.41
10. P.R., III-22
11. N.D., p.38
12. P.R., Kum., p. 76
13. "Āha Cārāyaṇaḥ Prakaraṇa nāṭakayorviṣkambhaḥ iti" N.L.R., pp. 37-38.
14. P.R., p: 76
15. B.P., p. 219
16. N.Y., p.80., Ka. P., XV-108
17. N.L.R., pp. 43-45
18. R.S., III-189
19. P.R. p. 76
20. D.R., p.32
21. S.D., p.294

22. P.R., pp. 76-77

23. "preveśayati pātrāṇi raṅgamiti praveśakaḥ", N.L.R., p.32

24. Ibid.,

25. N.S., XX-33

26. B.P., p.216, N.L.R., p.35

27. N.S., XX-34-36

28. N.L.R., p.35

29. Ibid.,

30. N.D., p.57

31. P.R., p.77

32. Ibid., Kum.

33. P.R., III-26

34. It may be noted hre that Vīthī as a sub-division has the eloquent bearing (Bhāratīvṛtti) where as a separate type of the play it resorts to Gay style (Kaiśikīvṛtti).

35. Vidyānātha explains Prarocana as "Praśaṃsyā 'bhimukhīkaraṇa rūpā bhāratī vṛtteraṅgam Prarocanā" (PR. p.88). The purpose of Prarocana is to make the audience propitious for witnessing the performance by way of commending the poetical virtues of the dramatist and penegyrising the critical acumen of the audience. This sort of encomium is said to be Prarocana.

36. Regarding Sūtradhāra, the following statement of Sāgaranandin deserves our attention : "Ka eṣa sūtradhāro nāma? Anuṣṭhānaṃ prayogasya sūtraṃ taddhārayatīti sūtradhāraḥ. Pūrvaraṅgamātropayogi bahiḥpātramityarthaḥ" (NLR., p.110)

37. A section of aesthetes consider that a variety of Āmukha is called Prastāvanā whereas some other opine that a type of Prastāvanā is called Āmukha. However, Dhanañjaya maintains no difference between Āmukha and Prastāvanā and hence Vidyānātha treats these two words as synonyms. As the actor called Sthāpaka conducts the Prastāvanā it is also called Sthāpanā. Some canonists have tried to

differentiate between Sthāpanā and Prastāvanā. In their view, Sthāpanā is more elaborate than Prastāvanā. But one could observe the brief Sthāpanas in the plays of Bhāsa.

38. P.R., Kum., p.78

39. P.R., III-28

40. P.R., p.79

41. S.D., VI-259

42. D.R., III-17

43. R.S., III-169

44. N.S., V-17-30

45. L.S.D., pp. 414 A, 414 B

46. B.P., pp. 194-95

47. P.R., III-37

48. Again there is adifference of opinion with regards to the concept of word (Pada). While some opine the foot of a verse is Pada, others contend the Śabda which is Suptiṅgaṁta is a Pada. Someothers consider the Avāntaravākya as Pada.

49. "Nandanti devatāḥ asyāmiti nāndī"

50. S.D., VI-25

51. N.S., V-107

52. B.P., p.197

53. R.S., III-138

54. D.R., III-4

55. P.R., III-4

56. P.R., III

57. Ibid., III-5

58. Ibid

59. P.R.

61. Ibid

62. P.R., p.71

63. P.R.,

64. P.R., Kum., p.71

65. N.L.R., p.

66. P.R., p.69

67. P.R., Kum., p.69

68. P.R., III

69. P.R., III-8

70. P.R., p.72

71. We find it to a large extent regarding all the ancillaries of the five junctures in Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra's Nāṭyadarpaṇa •

72. P.R., III-10

73. N.D., p. 96

74. P.R., Kum., p. 73

75. P.R., p. 75

76. S.D.,

77. Dhv., III-12

78. Vs. II

79. P.R., III-35, 36

80. "Abhigamyaguṇairyukto dhirodātta pratapavān" etc. Quoted from D.R., P.R., Kum. p.81.

81. N.S., XVIII-10; B.P., p.22; S.D., VI-7-9; R.S., III-130

82. S.D., VI-9; R.S., III-130

83. Sāgaranandin says that the hero should be a king According to his classification kings belong to Dhīralalita type. Thus his contention results in saying that Nāṭaka should have a Dhīralalita type of hero.

84. P.R., III-38

86. N.S., XX, 49-52, D.R., III-44-46; S.D., VI-224-26; N.D II-66-69; B.P., p.241; K.A., p.331; N.L.R., p. 263

87. P.R., Kum. p.82.

88. P.R. Kum. p. 82

89. P.R.,

90. D.R., III-54

91. "Avalagitamavaskando vyavahāro
Vipralambhamupapattiḥ I
Bhayamanṛtam vibhrāntirgadgadavāk ca pralāpaśca II
R.S., III. 270. N.S., XX-106; N.D., II-18; N.L.R., p.276; B.P., p. 247; D.R., III-35; P.R., III p. 82; S.D., VI-266-68.

92. P.R., p. 83.

93. N.S., XVIII-133-40; D.R. III-59; N.D., III-21, S.D., VI-241-44; B.P., p.247; N.L.R., p.266; R.S III-280-83

94. P.R., III-45; N.S., XX-94; D.R., III-60; B.P. p.248; N.L.R., p.265; N.D., II-27.

95. "Viśeṣeṇa āyujyante pātrāṇiyatra".

96. P.R., III-49-52

97. N.S., XVIII-114-28; D.R., III-62-68; B.P., p.248-50; N.L.R., p. 267

98. S.D., VI. 235.

99. N.D.

100. Monier Williams, P. 537

101. B.P., p. 249

102. N.S., p. 234

103. "Utkrmanonmukhasṛṣṭiḥ yāsāṁ tu utsṛṣṭāṅkaḥ tābhiḥ aṅkitaḥ iti guṇacandraḥ". N.D., p. 130

104. N.L.R., p. 270

105. P.R., Kum., p. 85

1. P.R., p.145
2. Cited by Kumārasvāmin, Ibid.,
3. Ibid.,
4. P.R., p.147
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. T.S., p. 76
8. R.G. p.149
9. Ratnaśāṇa
10. P.R., p. 147
11. P.R., Kum. p. 147
12. Ibid., pp. 147-148
13. Ibid., p. 148
14. Ibid., p. 148
15. Ibid., p. 149
16. Ibid.,
17. P.R., p. 149
18. "Nanu ceṣṭā lakṣanoddīpanavibhāvānāṁ bhāvahāvādīnāṁ śṛṅgārakāryataya' nubhāvatvaṁ pratīyate" etc., Ibid., Kum.
19. Bhāvaprakāśa, Quoted by Kumārasvāmin, Ibid., p. 149
20. Ibid
21. P.R., p. 150 (cited by Vidyanatha)
22. Bhāvaprakāśa, Quoted by Kumārasvāmin, Ibid
23. P.R., p. 151
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., pp. 151-152
26. "Vikṛtidarśanādijanyo manovikāro hāsaḥ" P.R., p. 152.
27. "Bibhrāṇān Kabarīdhṛtā" etc., P.R.,
28. "Iṣṭajanaviyogādināi tmani duhkhātibhūmiḥ śokaḥ"

29. Ibid.

30. "Śatrkṛtāpacāreṇa manaḥ prajvalanaṁ krodhaḥ" P.R.p. 153

31. P.R., p.153

32. "Lokottaresu kāryeṣu stveyān prayatna utsāhaḥ", Ibid., p.154.

33. "Kṣubdeṣvabdhiṣu" etc., Ibid

34. Quoted by Kumārasāmin, Ibid

35. "Raudrasandarśanādibhiranarthaśaṅkānaṁ bhayam" Ibid., p. 154

36. P.R., p.155

37. "Arthānāṁ doṣasandarśanādibhirgarhaṇa jugupsā", Ibid.

38. Ibid

39. "Apūrvārtha sandarśana cittavistāro vismayaḥ" Ibid

40. "Aunnatyam mahadanyadeva mahitaḥ" etc., Ibid., pp. 155-56

41. "Samo Vairāgyādinā nirvikāracittavam" Ibid., p. 156.

42. Ibid

43. "Nirvedasyāmaṅgalaprāyasya prathamamanupadeyatvepyupādānaṁ vyabhicāritvepi sthayitvābhidhānārtham. Tena nirvedasthāyibhāvaśśāntopi navamosti rasah". Mammaṭa. Quoted by Kumārasvāmin, P.R., p.156

44. P.R., Kum., p.156

45. Ibid.

46. P.R., p.158

47. Ibid

48. Ibid., p. 158

49. Ibid

50. P.R., p.159

51. Ibid

53. Ibid

54. Ibid

55. P.R.P. 159

56. Ibidl, p.160

57. "Matam gadgadabhāṣitvam vaisvaryaṁ pramadādijam"
Ibid.,

58. P.R., Kum., p. 159

59. Ibid

60. P.R., p. 161

61. Ibid., pp. 161-62

62. Ibid., 162

63. Ibid., p.162

64. Ibid., p. 163

65. Ibid

66. Ibid., pp. 163-64

67. Ibid., p. 164

68. Ibid.,

69. Ibid., p.165

70. Ibid

71. Ibid.,

72. Ibid., p. 166

73. Ibid

74. Ibid., pp.166-67

75. Ibid., p.167

76. Ibid., pp. 167-68

77. Ibid., p.168

78. Ibid., p. 168

79. Ibid., pp. 168-169

80. Ibid, p.169

81. Ibid., p. 169

82. Ibid
83. Ibid., pp. 169-170
84. P.R., p.170
85. Ibid
86. Ibid., p. 171
87. Ibid
88. Ibid
89. Ibid., p.172
90. Ibid
91. Ibid
92. Ibid., p. 173
93. Ibid., p. 174
94. Ibid., p. 174
95. Ibid., pp. 174-175
96. Ibid., p.175
97. Ibid
98. Ibid
99. Ibid., p.176
100. Ibid
101. Ibid
102. Ibid., p. 177
103. Ibid
104. Ibid., pp. 177-178
105. Ibid., p. 178
106. Ibid
107. Ibid., p. 179
108. Ibid., p.179
109. Ibid
110. Ibid., p.180
111. Dṛṅmanassaṅgasaṅkalpa jāgaraḥ Kṛśatā 'aratil

Hrītyāgonmāda mūrcchānta ityananga daśā II
Quoted by Kumārasvāmin, P.R., p180

112. P.R., pp. 180-181
113. Ibid., p. 181
114. Ibid
115. Ibid., p.182
116. Ibid., p.182
117. Ibid., pp. 182-183
118. Ibid., p. 183
119. Ibid
120. Ibid., pp. 183-184
121. Ibid., p. 184
122. Ibid
123. Ibid
124. Ibid., p. 185
125. Ibid
126. Ibid., 185-186
127. Ibid., p. 186
128. Ibid., p. 186-97
129. Ibid., Kum., p. 187
130. P.R., p. 188
131. Ibid
132. Ibid
133. Ibid., Kum., p. 189
134. P.R., Ibid
135. P.R., p. 189
136. Quoted by Kumārasvāmin, P.R., p. 190
137. Ibid
138. Quoted by Kumārasvāmin, P.R., p. 190

139. Ibid., p. 191

140. P.R., Kum., p. 191

141. Quoted by Kumārasvāmin, P.R., p. 191

142. P.R., Kum., p. 191

143. Quoted by Vidyānātha, P.R., p. 193

144. Ibid.,

145. Vy. V. p. 100

146. R.G., I-31

147. P.R. p. 177

148. Yathaikasya brahmānandasya candrakāntasōpānapankti pratibimbita candrabimbavadupādhibhedadanekadhā

Kalpanaṁ, tadvadatrāpi Vyañjakavibhāvādibhedādvastutaḥ ekasyāpi nānātvamiti veditavyam. P.R., Kum., p.194

149. "Raso vākyārthaḥ san vilasati padārthāḥ punarami Vibhāvādyā yasmin Kila dadhati viśrāntimucitām I

Ato bhāvā eva Kramasamuditānyonyavibhavā Rasībhāvaṁ bibhratyatha ca paṭatāṁ tantava iva II

Ibid., P.R.,

150. P.R., Kum., p. 194

151. Ibid.

152. Ibid., p. 195

153. "Bhāvesthāyini vardhamānavibhave ratyādike sindhuvat Kallolā iva sambhavanti vilayam Cāyānti bhāvā muhuḥ I

Nirvedādyupabhogabhāvita nijāsvādātireko raso

Loke syādanukārya eva Kathito nāṭye tu sāmājike II

P.R., p. 195

154. Ibid., Kum.

155. P.R., Kum., 196

156. Ibid.,

CHAPTER - V

1. K.D., I-7
2. P.R., p. 197.
3. S.K.A., I-7; P.R., V-3
4. P.R., p. 198
5. "Indro marutvan ..... duścavanastusaranmeghavāhanaḥ" A.K., I-9.
6. "Bṛndārakādaivatāni pumsiva devatāstriyam" Ibid., I-41-44
7. "Māyādivikalpitārthamayuktam" Ka. Su., 2.2.21.
8. K.P., p.169; S.D., p. 474; C.C., p.33
9. K.L., (Rud. Kav.) XI-5
10. P.R., V-12
11. S.K.A., I-9
12. Ibid., p. 17.
13. P.R., V-4.
14. Ibid., V-9
15. Ibid., V-8.
16. Ibid., V-13
17. Ibid., V-14.
18. "Yamakādau nirarthakatvam na doṣa iti kecit" Hem. Kav., p. 200
19. P.R., V-15.
20. Ibid
21. S.K.A., I-14
22. P.R., V-17
23. Ibid., V-9
24. "Aślīlamańgalaghṛṇavadartham grāmyamucyate" S.K.A., I-14.

25. P.R., V-24.

26. This is according to the Vārtika "Artiśṛdṛśibhyaśceti Vaktavyam"

27. P.R., V-29

28. Ibid

29. Ibid., V-30

30. Ibid., V-32

31. Ibid., V-33.

32. Ibid., V-35

33. Ibid., V-37

34. Ibid., V-39

35. Ibid., V-40

36. Ibid., V-42

37. Ibid., V-43

38. Ibid., V-45

39. Ibid., V-46

40. Asta. 8-3-17; 8-3-19

41. P.R., V-48

42. Ibid., V-49

43. Ibid., V-51

44. Ibid., V-52.

45. Ibid., V-54

46. Ibid., V-56

47. Ibid., V-60

48. S.K.A., I-47

49. P.R., V-62

50. Ibid., V-63

51. Ibid., V-65

52. Ibid., V-66

53. Asta - 3-4-21

54. P.R., V-68

55. S.K.A., I-49

56. P.R., Introduction, p.11

57. Ibid., V-69

58. Ibid., V-71

59. Ibid., V-72

60. Ibid., V-74

61. Ibid., V-75

62. Ibid., V-77

63. Ibid., V-78

64. Ibid., V-80

65. Ibid., V-81

66. Ibid., V-83

67. Ibid., V-86

CHAPTER - VI

1. P.R., P.217

2. K.D., I-43

3. R.G.p.228

4. P.R.p.217

5. Ka.Su. I - 3-6; K.D I - 45; S.K.A. I - 79

6. R.G. p. 238

7. NS XVII - 99

8. P.R. p. 217

9. K.D - I-47

10. P.R., p.218

11. "Mādhuryamuktamācāryaiḥ Krodhadāvapyatīvrata" SKA I-80

2. P.R. p.218

3. Ibid

15. P.R. p.219
16. N.S. XVII - 107
17. P.R. p.219
18. R.G. p.232
19. Ka. Su. I -3-22
20. P.R. p. 220
21. "Asayasyautkarṣastadudāttatvamiṣyate" S.K.A. I-82
22. N.S. XVII - 106
23. P.R. p.220
24. R.G. p. 234
25. P.R. p. 220
26. Ibid
27. Ibid., p. 221
28. Ibid., p. 222
29. R.G. p. 235
30. K.D. p. 193
31. C.L. IV - 5
32. P.R. p. 222
33. Ibid
34. Ibid., p. 223
35. Ibid
36. Ibid
37. Ibid., p.224
38. Ibid
39. Ibid
40. Ibid. p. 225
41. Ibid
42. "Eta eva ojaḥprasādaprabhṛtayorarthaguṇāḥ". Ka. Su. V-2-1.

43. Al. Sar. p. 9

CHAPTER - VII

1. P.R., p. 227
2. "Karaṇavyutpattya punaḥ alaṅkāraśabdo'yam upamādiṣu vartate" Ka. Su. I-I-2.

   "Upaskārakaḥ hārādaya ivālaṅkāraḥ", K.P. p. 301
3. P.R., p. 230
4. Ibid., p. 231
5. Ibid., p. 233
6. "Arthālaṅkāratvepyasya śabdapaunaruktyāśritat-tvacchabdālaṅkāra prastāve lakṣaṇam kṛtam. "Ud. Kav. p.3
7. "Arthapaunaruktyadevarthāśritatvādarthālaṅkara-tvaṁ jñeyam" Al. Sar. p. 21
8. "Ubhayālaṅkara'yam" K.P. p. 119
9. P.R. p. 233
10. P.R. Kum. pp. 233-34

CHAPTER - VIII

1. P.R., p. 236
2. Ibid
3. Ibid
4. Ibid., p. 237
5. Ibid., p. 238
6. Asta - 5-1-115
7. "Tatra tasyeva", Ibid., 5-1-116
8. P.R., p. 240
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 241
11. Ibid.,; p. 241
12. Ibid., p. 240

14. Ibid.
15. P.R., p. 241
16. Ibid., p. 244
17. Ibid., p. 245
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid
20. Ibid., p. 246
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid., p.247
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., p. 248
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., p. 249
29. K.P. X-46; S D X-27
30. P.R., Kum., p. 249
31. P.R., p. 250
32. Ibid
33. Ibid., p. 257
34. Ibid., p. 252
35. Ibid
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., p.253
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid., p. 254
41. S.D.X - 35

42. P.R.P. 255

43. Ibid.

44. S D X-35

45. K.P X-6

46. P.R., p. 256

47. Ibid.

48. KD II-25

49. Compare Ruyyaka's definition :

"Tasya ca trayī bandhacchāyā apahnavapūrvaka āropaḥ, āropapūrvakāpahnavaḥ, Chalādiśabdairasatyatva pratītipadakairvāpahnavanirdeśah. Al. Sar. p. 50

50. K.D. II-304; S.D X-38

51. P.R., p. 257

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid., p. 258

54. Ibid.

55. P.R., p. 260

56. P.R., p. 261

57. P.R., p. 261

58. Ibid., p.262

59. Ibid.

60. P.R., p.262

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid., p. 263

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

65. Ibid.

66. Ibid.

67. Ibid., . p. 264

68. Ibid

69. Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. P.R., p. 264
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid., p. 265
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid
78. Ibid., p. 266
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid.
82. Ibid.
83. Ibid., p. 267
84. Ibid., p. 268
85. Ibid.,
86. Ibid.,
87. Ibid., p. 269
88. Ibid. p. 270
89. Ibid., p. 270
90. "Pratāparudradevasya guṇavarṇanayā" etc., Ibid., p. 271
91. "Kalāpūrṇe nityam Jayati" etc, Ibid.,
92. Bh. Kav. II-79; K.D. II-205
93. K.P. X-11
94. SD X-55,56
95. "Sadyoviślathamekhalāṁpulakitā" etc., P.R., p. 272.
96. "Vītavrīḍamapāstamāna" etc. Ibid., pp. 272-73

97. Vidyānātha quotes this without mentioning the author. It is found in Rasakalika. Govt. Mss. Lib., Madras, R. 2241

98. "Bhutātmagunaratnaughaiḥ" etc., Ibid., p. 273

99. P.R. p. 274

100. Ibid.

101. Ibid.

102. Ibid., p. 275

103. "Bahuvallabhāḥ khalu raja" etc., Ibid., p.276

104. "Kāsṭe sundari vartate hṛdi sada" etc., Ibid

105. P.R., p. 277

106. Ibid.

107. Ka Su. IV-3-25

108. K.P. X-32; S.D. X-92

109. P.R., p. 278

110. Ibid.

111. Rud. Kav Vii-106

112. K.P. X-44; S.D. X-89

113. P.R. p. 279

114. K.P. X-134

115. P.R., p. 279

116. Compare K.P. X-51; S.D. X-90

117. P.R. VIII-139; K.P. X-52; S.D. X-90

118. P.R., p. 280; S.D. X-68

119. "Vastuto jātyādibhedānāmahṛdyattraechuḍdatva-ślesamūlatvābhyāṁ dvividho jñeyah" R.G. p. 418

120. P.R. p. 280

121. Ibid., p. 281

122. Ibid

123. Ibid.

124. Ibid., p. 282

125. Ibid.

126. Ibid.

127. Ibid.

128. "Nalanahuṣadilīpadharmaputra" etc., P.R., p. 283

129. P.R., p. 283

130. Ibid.

131. "Stoke brahmāṇḍarandhre" etc., Ibid., p.284

132. Ibid

133. Ibid., p. 285

134. K.D. II-299; Eka., p. 279; S.D. X-66

135. "Sa (atiśayoktiḥ) ca asyāmavyabhicāriṇīti na tadvadhenāsya utthānam, api tu tadanuprāṇitvena". Al. Sar. p. 125.

136. "Ma sma bhūtsarvatra vibhāvanāyāmatiśayoktiranuprāṇikā. Āhāryabhedabuddhimātramevānuprāṇakam. Tatra kvacidatiśayoktyā kvacicca rūpakeneti na doṣaḥ". R.G., p. 433

137. P.R., p. 285

138. Ibid.

139. K.P. X-34, 35.

140. P.R., p.287

141. Ibid.

142. Ibid.

43. Ibid., p.288

44. K.P. X-39; S.D. X-71

45. P.R., p. 288

46. Ibid.

47. "Sa ca Prastutānāmaprastutānāṁ ca pratisvam guṇena kriyayā ca sambandhe caturvidhā" Kum. Ibid.

48. "Kīrtanam stutinindārtham sā matā tulyayogitā" K.D. II-330

149. S.D. X-330

150. Bh. Kav. III-27

151. K.P. X-18

152. R.G., pp. 326-27

153. P.R., p. 289

154. Ibid.

155. Ibid., p. 290

156. Al. Sar., p. 72

157. P.R., p. 290

158. Ibid.

159. Ibid., p. 291

160. Ibid.

161. S.D. X-50

162. P.R., p. 292

163. Ibid.

164. Ibid., p. 293

165. Ibid.

166. "Anekārthasya śabdasya" etc., Ibid., p. 294.

167. Ibid.

168. Ibid., p. 295

169. Ibid.

170. Ibid.

171. Ibid., p. 296

172. Ibid., 297

173. Ibid.

174. Ibid

175. Ibid., p. 298

176. Ibid.

177. Ibid

178. Ibid., p.299

179. Ibid.

180. Ibid., p. 300

181. Ibid.

182. Ibid

183. Ibid., p. 301

184. Ibid.,

185. Ibid.,

186. Z., p. 30

187. Ibid., p. 303

188. Ibid

189. Ibid

190. Bh. Kav. II-71

191. K.D., II-169

192. S.D. X-61

193. P.R., p. 304

194. Ibid., p. 305.

195. Ibid

196. "Citrakarmasu varṇasaṅkaro Yatisu daṇḍagraha-ṇāni' ityādi Śleṣasamprutatvamasya atyanta cārutva nibandhanam". Al. Sar., p. 194.

197. P.R., p. 307

198. Ibid., pp. 307-308

199. Ibid., p. 308

200. Ibid.

201. Ibid. p. 309

202. Ibid.

203. Ibid., p. 310

204. Rud. Kav. IX-52-53

205. K.P. X-52-53

206. P.R., p. 313

207. Ibid.

208. Ibid., p. 314

209. Ibid

210. Ibid., p. 315

211. "Mahāpuruṣanāmudāttacaritānāmaṅgibhūtavast-vantaraṅgabhāvenopanibadhyamānam caritam codattam" Al. Sar. p. 231

212. "Rasabhava tadābhāsa" etc., P.R., Kum., p. 315

213. P.R., p. 316

214. Ibid.

215. Ibid

216. Ibid.

217. Ibid., p. 317

218. Ibid.

219. Ibid., p. 318

CHAPTER IX

1. P.R., pp. 319-320
2. Ibid., p.320
3. Ibid.,
4. Ibid
5. Ibid., p. 321
6. Ibid
7. Ibid., p. 322
8. Ibid

VIDYANATHA AS A POET

1. P.R., I-1
2. Ibid., I-17
3. Ibid., I-23

4. Ibid., II-20

5. Ibid., II-22

6. Ibid., II-31

7. Ibid., II-32

8. Ibid., II-37

9. P.R., II-41

10. Ibid., p. 102

11. Ibid., IV - 36

12. K.S. V - 85

13. P.R., IV-80

14. Srngara. 23

15. P.R., VIII-26

16. Ibid., VIII-109

17. Ibid., VIII-182

18. C.M. p.81

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS IN SANSKRIT

Abhinava Kālidāsa. *Nañjarājay-sobhūṣaṇa*, Baroda, Oriental Institute, 1930

Acyutarāya *Sāhityasāra*, Bombay, Nirnayasagar Press, 1906.

Amarasimha Mishra, *Amarakośa*, Kuala Lumpur, Satyadeva 1972.

Amṛtānandayogin *Alaṅkārasangraha*, Madras, The Adayar Library, 1949

Ānandavardhana *Dhvayāloka*, Motilal Banarasidas, 1963

Annambhaṭṭa *Tarkasangraha*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1969.

Appayadīkṣita *Vṛttivārtika*, Bombay, Nirnayasagar Press, 1910

Kuvalayānanda, Varanasi, Chowakhamba Vidya Bhavan, 1963.

Citramīmāmsa, Varanasi, Vinayvihar, 1965

Bālarāmayaṇa.

Bāna *Kādambarī*

Bhāmaha *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, Benaras, Chowkhamba Sanskrit series, 1985

Bhānudatta *Rasamañjarī*, Aligarh, Vivek Publications, 1981

Bharata	*Nāṭyaśāstra*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1929.
Bhāravi	*Kirātārjunīya*, Benaras, Chowkhamba Sanskrita Pustakalaya, 1952.
Bhartṛhari	*Śatakatrayādi subhāṣita Sangraha*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1948
	Vakyapadiya.
Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa	*Veṇīsamhāra*, Madras, Balamanorama ed. 1943.
Bhoja	*Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1976.
Bodhāyana	*Bhagavadajjukam*
Daṇḍin	*Kavyādarśa*, Madras, Vavilla ed,. 1952.
Dhanañjaya	*Daśarūpaka*, Bombay, Nirnayasagar Press, 1927.
Hanumana	*Hanumanāṭaka*, Varanasi, Chowkhamamba Sanskrit Series, 1967.
Hemacandra	*Kāvyā-nuśāsana*, Bombay, Sri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya.
Jagannātha	*Rasagaṅgādhara*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan, 1970.
Jayadeva	*Chandrāloka*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1960.
Kālidāsa	*Raghuvaṁśa*

	Vikramorvaśīya, New Delhi, Sahitya Akademi, 1961
	(The) Kumārasambhava ed. by M.R.Kale, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 6th ed., 1967
Kāmarājadīkṣita	*Kavyenduprakāśa*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1966.
Keśavamishra	*Alaṅkāraśekhara*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1927.
Mahimabhaṭṭa	*Vyaktiviveka*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1964
Mammaṭa	*Kāyvaprakāśa*, Varanasi, Bharatiya Vidya Prakasan, 1967.
Murāri	*Anargharāghava.*
Nāgeśabhaṭṭa	*Paramalaghumañjūṣā.*
	Nyāyadarśana
Pāṇini	Aṣṭādhyāyī, Delhi, Motilal Banarasidas, 1977
Ramacandra and Gunachandra	Nāṭyadarpaṇa, Delhi, Hindi Department, Delhi University, 1961.
Rājaśekhara	Kāvyamīmāṃsā, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1934.
Rudraṭa	Kāvyālaṅkāra., Bombay, Nirnyasagar Press, 1928.
Rudrabhaṭṭa	Rasakalikā, A transcript from Govt. Mss. Library, Madras.

Vidyānātha — Pratāprudrīya, ed by Dr. V. Raghavan, Madras, Samskrta Vidyasamiti, 1970.

Viśvanātha — Sāhityadarpaṇa, Bombay, Nirayansagar Press, 1922.

Viśveśvara — Chamtkāracandrikā, Andhrauniversity Waltair, 1969.

BOOKS IN ENGLISH

Aspects of sanskrit Literature by S.K.De, Firma K.L.Mukhopadhyay, 1959.

A Bibliography of the sanskrit Drama by Montgomery Schuyler, Asian Publication Services, New Delhi, 1977.

Comparative Studies in Pali & Sanskrit Alankaras, Part I by Herambanath Chaterjee, Sanskrit Pustak Bandar, Calcutta, 1960.

Concepts of Poetic Blemishes in Sanskrit poetics by Bachan Jha, Chowkhamamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1965.

Concepts of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics by P.C. Lahari, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation New Delhi, 1974.

Dhvanyāloka (Translated into English with Notes) by Dr. K.KrishnaMoorthy, Oriental Book agency, poona, 1955.

Dhvanyāloka and its Cretics by Dr. K.Krishna Moorthy, Kyvyaloka Publishers , Mysore, 1967.

Drama in Sanskrit Literature by Adya Rangacharya, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 2nd ed. 1967.

Essays in Sanskrit Criticism by K.Krishnamoorthy, Karnatak University, Darwar, 1964.

History of Sanskrit Poetics by P.V.Kane, Motilal Banarasi Dass, Delhi, 4th ed., 1971.

Rudrata	Alaṅkārasarvasva, Bombay, Nirnyansagar Press, 1939.
Sāgaranandin	Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1972.
Śāradātanaya	Bhāvaprakāśa, Baroda, Oriental Institute, 1968.
Sarveśvara	Sāhityasāra, Trivendrum, The university Manuscripts Library, 1948.
Siṅghabhūpāla	Rasārṇavasudhākara ed. by T.Venkatacharya, Madras, The Adayar Library and Research Institute, 1979.
Tirumalācārya, Chilakamarri	Ratnaśāṇa, Commentary on Pratāparudrīya.
Trivedi. K.H	The NāṭyaDarpaṇa of Ramachandra and Gunachandra. A,Critical Study, Ahmedabad, L.D. Institute of Indology, 1966.
Udbhaṭa	Kāvyānuśāsana, Bombay, Nirnyasagar Press, 1915.
Vāgbhaṭa	Kāvyānuśāsana, Bombay, Nirayansagar Press, 1915
	Vegabhatalankara, Varanasī Chowakhamba Vidya Bhavan, 1957.
Vāmana	Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti, Bombay, Nirnayasagar Press, 1953
Vedavyāsa	Agnipurāṇa, Varanasi, Chowkhamamba Sanskrit Series, 1966.
Vidyādhara	Ekāvalī

Indian Aesthetics by K.S.Rameswar Sastry, Sri Vainivilas Press, Srirangam, 1928.

Indian Asthetics and Science of Language by Dr. Tarapadachakrabarti, Sanskrit Pustak Bandar, Calcutta, 1971.

Laws & Practice of Sanskrit Drama by Surendranath Sastri, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1961.

Literacy Criticism in Ancient India by Dr. Ramarajan Mukherji, Sanskrit Pustak Bandar, Calcutta, 1966.

Natakalakshna Ratnakosa In the prespective of ancient Drama and Dramaturgy by Siddheswar Chattopadhyaya, Punti Pustak, Calcutta, 1974.

(The) Number of Rasas by V. Raghavan, Adayar Library, Madras, 1940.

(The) Origin and Development of the theory of Rasa and Dhavani in Sanskrit Poetics by Dr. Tapasvi S. nandi, Gujarat University Ahmedabad, 1973.

Outlines of Sanskrit Poetics, by G.Vijayavardhana, Chowkhamamba Publication, Varanasi, 1970.

Principles of Literary and Criticism in Sanskrit edited by Dr R.C. Dwivedi, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, 1969.

Sanskrit Poetics by Krishna Chitanya, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1965.

(The) Science and Criticism in India by Dr. A.K.Warder, The Adayar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1978.

Some aspects of Literary criticism in sanskrit by A. Shankaran Oriental Books Reprint Corporation New Delhi, 2nd ed., 1973.

Some concepts of the Alankāraśāstra by V. Raghavan, The Adayar Library, Madras, 1942.

A Study of Alankaras in Sanskrit Mahakavyas and Khandakayvas by Antonio Binimelis Sagera, Bharatiya Vidya Prakasan, Delhi, 1977.

(The) Theory of Rasa and Sanskrit Drama by D.R.Mankend.

BOOK IN FRENCH

Fillizoat, PierreSylvain. Le Prataparudriya Pandichery Institute Francais D' Indologue, 1963.

BOOKS IN TELUGU

Prakāśavarṣa Rasārṇavālaṅkāra Kakinada, Andhra sahitya Parishad, 1937.

Rangacarya,Celamacerla Āndhra Prataparudrayaśobhūṣaṇamu

Śāradātanaya Bhāvaprakāśanamu edited by Madhavaramasarma, Jammulamadaka, Hyderabad, A.P. Sangitanataka Academi, 1973.